ORIGINAL

No. 88-5746

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

BERNARD LEE HAMILTON,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
to the Supreme Court of California

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General
of the State of California

STEVE WHITE,
Chief Assistant Attorney General

FREDERICK R. MILLAR, JR.,
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

PAT ZAHAROPOULOS,
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

110 West A Street, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 237-7857

Attorneys for Respondent

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. In view of the fact that the guilt phase had been affirmed, did the California Supreme Court's reconsideration of the entire case after this Court vacated the judgment and remanded for further consideration in light of Rose v. Clark (1986) 478 U.S. 570, prejudice petitioner in any way?

2. Where state law provides for a unitary trial in two phases, did denial of petitioner's motion to represent himself at the penalty phase abridge his Sixth Amendment right of self representation?

3. After informing the jury that any factor could be considered in mitigation did instructions and argument stating it must return a death verdict if the specified factors in aggravation outweighed all possible factors in mitigation mislead the jury regarding leniency?

PARTIES

Petitioner, Bernard Lee Hamilton, is a prisoner incarcerated under judgment of death at the California State Prison at San Quentin, California. Respondent is the People of the State of California.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

OPINION BELOW

Petitioner seeks review of an opinion of the California Supreme Court affirming his judgment of death. (People v. Hamilton (1988) 45 Cal.3d 351, as modified at 1034a upon denial of rehearing; attached in Appendix 1(a).)

JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1257(3).

CONSTITUTION, STATUTES AND PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitution, Sixth, Eighth and Fifteenth Amendments, and California Penal Code sections 190.3 and 190.4 subdivision (d). These provisions appear in Appendix 2 of the petition.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In an information filed by the District Attorney of San Diego County on July 11, 1979, petitioner was charged in four felony counts as follows: count I, vehicular burglary (Cal. Pen. Code, { 459); count II, robbery (Cal. Pen. Code, { 211); count III, kidnapping (Cal. Pen. Code, { 207); and count IV, murder under special circumstances. Allegations contended petitioner murdered Eleanor Buchanan during the commission of a robbery, kidnapping and/or burglary (Cal. Pen. Code, { 190.2). (CT 45-46.)[1/]

The information further alleged two prior felony convictions (a 1972 forgery and a 1973 burglary). (CT 45-46.) Petitioner was arraigned on July 16, 1979, and denied all charges, allegations and prior convictions. (CT 87.)

Jury trial began on November 3, 1980. (CT 1457.) On January 5, 1981, the jury convicted petitioner of burglary, robbery, kidnapping, and first-degree murder, and found all special circumstances true. (CT 1204-1210.) Thereafter, the penalty phase was held and the jury fixed the punishment at death. (CT 1335.)

---

1. "CT" refers to the clerk's transcript and "RT" refers to the reporter's transcript of the trial.

Upon automatic appeal to the California Supreme Court, the judgment of guilt was affirmed, but the special circumstances and death penalty judgments were reversed. (People v. Hamilton (1985) 41 Cal.3d 408; Appendix 1(b).)

On May 7, 1986, the People filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari. On July 7, 1986, this Court granted the petition, vacated the judgment and remanded the case to the California Supreme Court "for further consideration in light of Rose v. Clark (1986) 478 U.S. ___." (California v. Hamilton (1986) ___ U.S.___ [92 L.Ed.2d 734].) On September 2, 1986, the case was argued to the California Supreme Court, but no opinion was filed. On September 9, 1987, the case was re-argued to the California Supreme Court. On May 19, 1988, the California Supreme Court affirmed petitioner's convictions and death penalty. (People v. Hamilton/In re Hamilton (1988) 45 Cal.3d 351, as modified on July 28, 1988, in 46 Cal.3d 1034a.

Statement of Facts

On the evening of May 30, 1979, 24-year-old Eleanor Buchanan (the victim) had dinner with her husband and two infant sons, then left for school in their new van. They had purchased the van about six weeks earlier and her husband, a dental supply salesman, used it in his work during the day, carrying literature and samples. He told his wife there was very little gas in the van and not to add any because he was taking it to the dealer the next morning to replace the tank due to a leak.[2/] (RT 2079, 2077, 2099-2101, 2151.)

Mrs. Buchanan had given birth three weeks earlier and was nursing her baby. She cut chunks of diaper, put them over her nipples to keep milk from leaking on her clothes and left for school at 6:30 p.m. She was wearing tan Levi's, a striped beige

---

2. All locks and windows worked and nothing was broken on the van when Buchanan turned it over to his wife. When respondent was arrested in it on June 8th, the arm rest of the driver's chair, the metal rod on the ceiling that holds the curtain suspended behind the driver and the wind wing on the passenger's side were all broken. (RT 2086, 2106-2107, 2573, 2577.)

and brown T-shirt, white knee socks, bra, panties and a simulated leather purse. (RT 2079, 2077, 2099-2101, 2151.)

Buchanan habitually locked the van, which had valuables in it including dental equipment from her husband's work. (RT 2146, 2150-2151, 2156, 2106, 2083.)

On May 30, 1979, she left her math class early after obtaining xeroxed class notes from fellow students because an optional quiz was offered and she had been absent for the birth of her three-week-old son. Students saw her walking towards the parking lot about 9:30 p.m. (RT 2160, 2162, 2171-2173, 2181-2183.)

At about 1:52 a.m. on May 31, 1979, petitioner called Donna Hatch in Terrell, Texas to say he had gotten a van and was leaving for Texas when he could get gas. (RT 2363-2364, 2444-2445.)

There was a gasoline shortage during this time and fuel was sold for limited hours. Between 4:30 a.m. and 10:15 a.m. on May 31, 1979, petitioner purchased gas for the Buchanans' van on their Visa card at Roy's Service Station off Highway 8 in El Cajon, California. He signed the invoice, "Terry Buchanan". (RT 2206-2207, 2210-2211.)

About noon on the same day, Eleanor Buchanan's headless, handless body was found in the grass near a cul-de-sac off Pine Valley Road near San Diego. The cul-de-sac was 200 yards off Interstate 8. The body was in full rigor mortis with the elbow in an upright position, completely off the ground, when a deputy sheriff arrived at the scene between 1:30 and 2:00 p.m. Two strings of twine were attached around Buchanan's ankles and there were dark blue pieces of lint sticking to her blood. The body was clothed in a bra, underpants and socks. The head and hands were never found. (RT 2278-2279, 2289-2290.)

During the autopsy, it was determined that a horizontal stab wound in the abdomen was inflicted before death. Three superficial wounds measuring up to five inches on the abdomen were inflicted after death. The pathologist could not determine

cause of death because of the absence of the head, but ruled out natural causes. He could not say whether the hands were cut off while Eleanor Buchanan was alive, but suspected she was dead because there was not much hemorrhaging. He could not say whether she was alive when the head was cut and sawed off. (RT 2337, 2333.) Judging from the rigor mortis, death occurred about 16 hours before the autopsy, about midnight on May 30, 1979. (RT 2340-2341.)

Meanwhile, petitioner continued to drive down Interstate 8 from San Diego to Texas. (RT 2216, 2223, 2258-2259, 2264-2265.) He arrived at Donna Hatch's home in Terrell, Texas, on the evening of June 1, 1979. He was alone. The van was dirty, had a broken arm on the driver's chair, a broken mirror and a broken wind wing. (RT 2364-2368.)

Petitioner was on bail pending trial on a robbery charge. (See RT 3563.) He took Donna with him to get addresses for his defense in that case. She saw the Buchanans' credit cards in the van and petitioner used them for food and gas. (RT 2369-2373, 2376.)

On June 3, 1979, Donna was in the van with petitioner and her daughter and saw a highway patrolman. When Donna suddenly turned, while talking to her little girl, petitioner told her not to make sudden moves because they could get shot. She asked why, but he gave no direct answer. Petitioner stopped at a pay phone to call his brother and his friend, Clifton. (RT 2376-2379.) Donna heard petitioner tell his brother he had flown to Texas. (RT 2380.)

Cliff Harris and petitioner knew each other all their lives and were good friends. (RT 2489.) Petitioner told Harris he drove to Texas in a blue El Dorado. Harris was watching TV as they spoke and saw a report that the headless body had been found. He told petitioner. (RT 2490-2492; 3594, 3596.)

Petitioner had changed when he returned to the van after talking to Clifton Harris. (RT 2380.) Donna asked what was wrong. Petitioner said he thought he killed a man. When

they returned to her home, petitioner said he would let the van sit a while to see if anyone paid attention to it and that he needed Texas license plates. He asked her to go to a car lot with him to get the plates, but she refused. (RT 2380-2381.)

The next day, Donna broke up with petitioner. Petitioner said if she had changed her mind because he had lied about his wife being dead, he would kill the ex-wife. (RT 2382.)

Petitioner called Donna on Wednesday, June 6, 1979, to discuss bringing her back to California to testify in his robbery case. (RT 2470-2471.) At one point, a friend of Donna's also got on the phone. Petitioner said, "I'm going to kill you and your friend, too. And you won't know when I'll be around because I don't have to be driving this van, I can be in another vehicle." (RT 2474.) Donna never saw petitioner after that phone call. (RT 2471-2472, 2382-2384, 2475.)

Petitioner continued to use the Buchanans' credit card. It was stipulated he charged a saw, screwdriver and set of wrenches at Babcock Auto Supply in Terrell, Texas, on June 6, 1979, (2518-2519), and a butcher knife and two hanks of twine at Moses five and ten cent store on June 7, 1979. (RT 2519-2520.)

At about 8:30 a.m. on June 8, 1979, petitioner entered Stuckey's restaurant in Marietta, Oklahoma. He charged food on Buchanans' Visa, picked up part of his food order and ran out as the manager was calling for authorization on the purchase. The manager called law enforcement authorities and described petitioner and the van. (RT 2746-2747, 2755-2757.)

That afternoon, petitioner was stopped by Oklahoma officers and they ran a VIN number check. They learned the van belonged to a homicide victim. The officers arrested petitioner on the local charges. (RT 2598-2599.)

On the way to jail, petitioner passed a poster offering a $500.00 reward for David L. Wall, alias "Spider". (RT 2578, 2581.)

On June 9, 1979, San Diego police officers questioned petitioner in Oklahoma after reading him his Miranda rights.

petitioner said he got the van from Fran, a white woman who had left her husband for "Spider", and that he knew "Spider" for six years.[3] Fran and Spider were in Shreveport. They gave him the van and her charge cards to use for food and gasoline. (CT 2846-2848, 2854, 2862.)

Petitioner said he saw no blood in the van and the blood on his shoe was his own. (RT 2945-2946, 2904.) A criminalist testified at trial that the blood on petitioner's shoe was type O, like Eleanor Buchanan's. (RT 2127.) Petitioner was type A. (RT 3112, 3110, 3114.) The criminalist further testified the blood could not have come from the van's carpeting, but went on wet. It had no blue fibers in it. (RT 2127, 4017-4018.)

The police showed petitioner a photograph of Eleanor Buchanan during questioning and asked if that were Fran. He said it looked like her but Fran was a little skinnier. Asked what Fran was wearing when she and Spider picked him up to leave San Diego, petitioner said the only time he saw her, she wore light jeans and a beige non-leather purse. (RT 2873-2875.)

En route to San Diego petitioner was disturbed about the arrest for murder and kept saying it was not going to stick because all the police had was a body they could not identify and a run-away wife. (RT 2950.)

Shortly after petitioner's return to San Diego, Terry Buchanan received a letter with petitioner's return address in county jail. It said, "You are probably full of grief when you should be highly pissed-off . . ." because Fran was not dead but had left with Spider and was smoking Sherman sticks. Buchanan turned the letter over to the District Attorney's Office. (RT 2140-2145.)

---

3. Neither petitioner's parents (RT 2048, 2078), nor friends (RT 2489-2734) ever heard of "Spider". "Fran" was Eleanor Buchanan's nickname. It was written on the school papers she was carrying on the night she disappeared and also in an unmailed birth announcement she had in her purse. (RT 2116-2117.)

Petitioner hinted to a local girlfriend in letters and during a jail visit that she should call Terry Buchanan and the press, posing as Eleanor Buchanan, and tell them she was alive. (RT 3618-3621.)

On January 24, 1980, petitioner was talking about his case to another prisoner. The prisoner said, "Who are you trying to convince, Hamilton, me or yourself?" Hamilton replied, "Well, I did it, but they'll never prove it." (RT 3023, 3030.) The prisoner reported the conversation to a guard. (RT 3032.)

While transporting petitioner between the jail and courtroom for trial, a deputy sheriff was tightening petitioner's security chains. Petitioner said, "You go ahead and have your fun, I'll have mine later." The guard responded, "I thought you already had your fun?" Petitioner replied, "Yeah, and I'll kill you and a lot more, too, and you may be first on my list." (RT 3327-3329.)

Defense

Petitioner testified that he saw the Buchanans' van parked on the street with Eleanor's purse on the passenger seat just after midnight on May 31, 1979, and took it. (RT 3608, 3439.) He never saw the victim dead or alive. (RT 3438.)[4/] Petitioner believed she was killed by Harry Piper, who dumped the body then pretended to find it. (RT 2428.)

Rebuttal

Harry Piper had two crushed vertebrae and could not lift anything at the time he found the body. (RT 3981.) Furthermore, his car was parked over the drag mark, so the body was there when he drove up. (Trial Exh. T and RT 3718, 3879.)

Penalty Phase

Petitioner had five prior felony convictions for forgery, burglary, and auto theft. (RT 4478-4479.)

---

4. However, he told police officers during questioning that the victim wore light colored jeans when she left with Spider (RT 2875) and she was in fact wearing tan levis when she left for school the night she disappeared. (RT 2100-210].)

On November 7, 1976, he robbed and beat Ruth Story, an elderly woman who was walking down a Linda Vista Street with a cane. (RT 4448-4452, 4552.) She was hospitalized and had reconstructive plastic surgery on her face. Five years later, she was still in pain and unable to chew even hamburger. (RT 4455, 4471-4472.) In a letter to the victim dated November 17, 1978, petitioner stated he did not know her personally. (RT 4527-4528, 4530.) Eleven days later, the district attorney received a letter from petitioner claiming the victim used to pay him for sexual services from 1967-1969, when he was a minor. (RT 4541.)

In February, 1979, after spending the night in a motel with Rosie Blackman, whom petitioner had seen frequently for three months, he punched and kicked her all over her body. She made no attempt to strike back. (RT 4429, 4434-4437.) A few weeks later, he came up to her at work as she was cleaning her taxi cab and repeatedly kicked her head and body. Her supervisor called the police. (RT 4435-4436.)

While in custody on October 8, 1980, petitioner refused to go to court and assumed a fighting stance when deputies entered his cell. He had to be physically carried down the corridor. He yelled obscenities, threatened to fight the deputies and spit in the face of one of the officers. (RT 4400-4422.)

Penalty Defense

Petitioner is 29 years old and essentially had a good home life as the sixth of eight children. His father is a Baptist minister. (RT 4587.) He has eight and nine year old sons who live in Los Angeles with his ex-wife. (RT 4606-4608.) Relatives and family friends asked the jury to spare his life. (See also, People v. Hamilton, supra, 45 Cal.3d at 357-362, guilt phase facts; 364-366, penalty phase facts.)

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENT'S ARGUMENT

Any error in reconsidering petitioner's affirmed guilt phase after the judgment was vacated by this Court could only have benefited him. This would be the wrong case to further define state courts' ability to reconsider issues on remand, because the reconsideration resulted in no change.

The death penalty is defined in California in a two-phase unitary trial. Thus, petitioner's motion for self-representation made five days before starting the penalty phase was in essence a request to change attorneys mid-trial and was addressed to the discretion of the trial court. Denial of the motion was not error, in view of the outstanding performance of attorneys representing petitioner, the fact his complaints about them were without merit and there was fear of obstructionist and disruptive conduct due to petitioner's violent confrontations with court personnel in the jail.

Instructing the jury it "shall" impose the death penalty if aggravating circumstances outweighed mitigating circumstances and "shall" impose life without possibility of parole if mitigating circumstances outweighed aggravating circumstances, did not prevent the jury from considering any relevant mitigation.

For those reasons, the petition should be denied.

ARGUMENT

I

UPON RECEIPT OF THE VACATED JUDGMENT, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT PROPERLY RECONSIDERED THE ENTIRE CASE; IN ANY EVENT, PETITIONER SUFFERED NO PREJUDICE SINCE ALL GUILT PHASE ISSUES HAD BEEN RESOLVED AGAINST HIM, AND RECONSIDERATION COULD NOT HAVE LEFT HIM IN A WORSE POSITION

Petitioner contends this Court "should not permit a state court to re-open issues otherwise foreclosed to it in violation of this Court's remand order." (Pet., p. 9.) The California Supreme Court felt free to reconsider the guilt phase issues because this Court's order "vacated" the judgment. In view of the fact that all guilt phase issues had been affirmed as to petitioner, reconsideration could not have enhanced the state's position. Thus, petitioner got another bite at the apple and should not be heard further.

The California Supreme Court initially affirmed petitioner's convictions, but reversed the jury's special circumstance findings, which had rendered him death eligible, because the jury had not been instructed to find petitioner intended to kill. (People v. Hamilton (1985) 41 Cal.3d 408, citing Carlos v. Superior Court (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131.) On July 7, 1986, this Court ordered "the judgment is vacated and the case is remanded to the Supreme Court of California for further consideration in light of Ross v. Clark, 478 U.S. ___ (1986)." (California v. Hamilton (1986) 478 U.S. 1017.)

On May 19, 1988, the California Supreme Court issued the instant opinion. (People v. Hamilton (1988) 45 Cal.3d 351 (Hamilton II).) Contrary to the assumption of the parties', the California Supreme Court concluded "the cause in its entirety is properly before us. This is so because the United States Supreme Court vacated the judgment in Hamilton I and rendered the decision a nullity." (Id., at p. 363.)[5/]

---

5. To the extent petitioner complains "Hamilton II was based upon a case decided by that court after this Court's remand order" (Ptn., p. 4), the California Supreme Court approached the harmless error issue remanded to it by deciding there was no error. We see no error.

When it grants certiorari, vacates a judgment and remands for further consideration, this Court does not make a final determination on the merits. (Henry v. City of Rockhill (1963) 376 U.S. 776, 777.) Such action means that this Court is "not certain that the case was free from all obstacles to reversal on an intervening precedent . . ." (Id., at p. 776.)6/ Should the court wish to give further definition to the term "vacated" judgments, this would not be the proper case.

Here, as in Elfbrandt v. Russell (1965) 384 U.S. 11, 12, the State Supreme Court on reconsideration reinstated the original judgment. It had both the right and power to do that under this Court's order. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the guilt phase had been completely affirmed by Hamilton I, petitioner could suffer no prejudice by the reconsideration. Should the court wish to give further definition to the effect of "vacated" judgments, this would not be the proper case.

The reconsideration resulted in no change. Any error in considering the guilt phase again was potentially beneficial to petitioner. Consequently, no right of his was infringed in that he got a free second review of his convictions.

---

6. Lower court cases have held that the word "vacate" as applied to a judgment means to annul, set aside or render void. (Ohio Fuel Gas Co. v. City of Mt. Vernon (1930) 37 Ohio App. 159, 166, 174 N.E. 260, 262; Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Ed., p. 1717, citing Stewart v. O'Neal (1917) 237 F. 897, 903; see also, Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University v. Tureaud (5th Cir. 1955) 226 F.2d 714, 717.)

II

IN A UNITARY TRIAL, PETITIONER'S CONDITIONAL REQUEST TO REPRESENT HIMSELF AT THE PENALTY PHASE WAS DENIED WITHOUT ABUSE OF DISCRETION AS WAS HIS LATER UNEQUIVOCAL REQUEST

Petitioner contends he filed a motion to represent himself in the penalty phase on the day the jury found him guilty of first-degree murder and special circumstances. That being the moment the need for penalty proceedings first becomes apparent, he argues the motion was timely and should have been granted as a matter of right. (Ptn., pp. 10-15.) Under state law, the death penalty trial is a unitary one with two phases, so that a motion at the close of the guilt phase is addressed to the discretion of the trial court. Furthermore, petitioner's request was conditional. The unequivocal request for self-representation on January 15, 1981, came after a history of equivocal, conditional requests, obstreperous behavior and violent attacks on people involved in the court process. Both requests were denied without abuse of discretion.

Guilty verdicts were filed on January 6, 1981. (CT 1204-1210.) On the same day, petitioner moved the trial court to relieve counsel or alternatively to allow him to represent himself because counsel had refused to include in final argument petitioner's belief that the perpetrator of the crime planned it and entered the vehicle with specific intent to kidnap or kill the victim, had knowledge of her activities and a personal grudge against her. The motion was summarily denied. (CT 1202-1203.)

On January 15, 1981, a hearing was held on petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner had subpoenaed 12 people for the hearing but had used the case number of the robbery case which was trailing the death penalty trial. Consequently, when the witnesses contacted defense counsel, they were told the robbery would not be heard that day. (66RT 4318, 4285-4286.) As it turned out, petitioner merely wanted to interview these people to see if they had done certain things he had requested. Specifically, he had heard there was a confession to the murder by a Mesa College student. (66RT 4291-4292.)

Counsel said the matter had been investigated thoroughly. (66RT 4319-4320.) During these discussions, petitioner did say unequivocally that he did not want to be represented by counsel. (66RT 4316.) This motion, five days before the penalty phase opened, was denied. (Hamilton II, supra, 45 Cal.3d at p. 367.)

Faretta v. California (1975) 422 U.S. 806, established a defendant's Federal constitutional right to represent himself without counsel upon voluntary and intelligent election. In order to invoke the constitutionally mandated right of self-representation, a defendant in a criminal trial should make an unequivocal assertion of that right within a reasonable time before commencement of trial. (People v. Windham (1977) 19 Cal.3d 121, 128.) However, once a defendant has chosen to proceed to trial represented by counsel, his demands to discharge the attorney and proceed pro se are addressed to the sound discretion of the court. Among the factors a trial court should consider when exercising that discretion are the quality of counsel's representation of the defendant, defendant's prior proclivity to substitute counsel, the reasons for the request, the length and stage of the proceedings and the disruption or delay which might reasonably be expected to flow from the granting of such a motion. (Id., at pp. 128-129.)

Here, petitioner's January 15, 1981, request to represent himself was five days before the opening of the penalty phase, the second stage of a unitary capital trial. Thus, the motion was addressed to the discretion of the trial court. (See, People v. Moore (Filed Nov. 3, 1988 in CR 23721) ___ Cal.3d ___, upholding a finding of untimeliness regarding a motion made three days before the penalty trial began. [Slip. opn., pp. 14-20].)

The denial was not an abuse of discretion. The trial judge observed that the defense team had done an outstanding job in representation of the defendant, petitioner's complaints were "totally and completely without merit" (66RT 4320), and petitioner had had violent confrontations with deputies in the

jail as well as violent confrontations with other persons. (66RT 4320-4322; Hamilton II, supra, 45 Cal.3d at pp. 367-368.)

The trial court's denial of the motion in question was neither erroneous nor an abuse of discretion. The California Supreme Court ruled the right of self-representation applies to the guilt phase of death penalty cases. (People v. Terone (1979) 23 Cal.3d 103, 113.) However, petitioner failed to make a motion to represent himself pre-trial. His motion came five days before the second phase of a unitary trial was to begin. As such, the right of self representation was no longer a matter of right, but a matter of court discretion.

Petitioner argues the penalty phase is "itself a trial on the issue of punishment . . . ," citing Bullington v. Missouri (1981) 451 U.S. 430, 437, and a dissenting opinion applying Bullington to the right of counsel and self-representation, Petition, pages 12-13.

The timeliness of a motion for self-representation in the penalty phase is properly left to state law. The California Supreme Court recently refused to equate the separate phases of trial to separate "proceedings," so as to require a witness to invoke the Fifth Amendment privilege at each. (People v. Malone (filed Nov. 3, 1988 in CR 23115) ___ Cal.3d ___, slip opn., p. 45.)

Even if this Court wished to speak to the issue of a unitary two phase capital trial, this is not the proper case in view of the petitioner's proclivity toward changing attorneys, by his attempts to use motions for self-representation as tactical maneuvers to get his way and his penchant for violence outside the courtroom towards people involved in the court process.

Due to incompatibility, Patrick O'Connor was relieved as petitioner's attorney on September 25, 1979, (CT 305-308), Jerry Wallingford was relieved two months later (CT 369), and five months after that petitioner moved to relieve Thomas Ryan and Vivian Camberg, his third and fourth attorneys. (17RT 5.)

Upon denial of his motion, petitioner said, "I request to represent myself then. I might as well." (17RT 30.) Petitioner was told the matter was not before the court, but he could "make that motion properly if he would desire to do so." (RT 30-31.) (See Hamilton II, supra, 45 Cal.3d at p. 366.)

On May 1, 1980, petitioner filed a motion to relieve counsel and represent himself. (CT 667.6, 70.) Apparently, he withdrew that motion before the court had an opportunity to rule on it when he was granted the status of co-counsel with the understanding that Thomas Ryan would be the lead attorney and decide tactics. (Representations of counsel at 19RT 28-29; Hamilton II, supra, 45 Cal.3d at p. 366.)

Petitioner had disagreements with counsel and often requested their replacement. At times the requests were conditional or were withdrawn without ruling. (See Hamilton I, 41 Cal.3d 408, 420-421.)

Furthermore, petitioner had a proclivity for long narrative complaints about factual disputes that refuted his version of the facts (see 72RT 58-63), and was willing to boldly state his questions were not being answered when a three-person defense team was in constant contact with him. (72RT 70-71; 19RT 446.) He had attacked people involved in the court process at the jail and threatened to disrupt the court proceedings by attacking his attorneys or even the judge. (72RT 32.)

The right of self-representation can be denied if the there is reason to fear obstructionist or unruly conduct. (Davis v. Morris (9th Cir. 1981) 657 F.2d 1104, 1106, citing other authorities.) The Faretta decision states that serious and disruptive conduct is ground for terminating self-representation. (Faretta v. California, supra, 422 U.S. 806, 834.)

In these circumstances, the court did not abuse its discretion by denying petitioner's motion for self-representation at the penalty phase. This was in essence a motion to change attorneys because under California law capital cases consist of a

unitary trial. (See, People v. Hamilton II, supra, 45 Cal.3d at p. 369; People v. Malone, supra, slip opn., at p. 45.) Furthermore, petitioner had changed counsel twice and had made requests for self-representation as a tactic to get other things he wanted. He was also violent outside the courtroom and had threatened to attack court personnel or the judge, which presented a potential for disruptive conduct in court. In these circumstances, the trial court properly denied the motion. Furthermore, for the reasons stated, this would not be the proper case for this Court to decide the timeliness of self-representation requests in unitary trials.

III

THE INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN PROVIDED GUIDED DISCRETION IN SETTING THE PENALTY WITHOUT PREVENTING THE JURY FROM CONSIDERING ANY MITIGATING EVIDENCE IN THE CASE

Petitioner objects to the language in CALJIC No. 8.84.2 stating the jury "shall" impose the death penalty if it finds the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating factors. Petitioner's jury was instructed not only that it could consider the statutory factors in aggravation but that it could consider anything in mitigation. Thus, it was not possible for the jury to conclude the aggravating circumstances technically outweighed the mitigating yet it must return a death verdict even if it believed the lesser sentence was appropriate.

First, we observe the instruction told the jury to weigh, not add, circumstances and to impose death "[i]f you conclude that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances . . ." (RT 4669, emphasis added.) The jury was left free to judge the quality of each factor and to assign it whatever weight it felt appropriate. This Court has held a death penalty based on affirmative answers to two questions (deliberate acts and future dangerousness) by the jury does not violate the Eighth Amendment, because it does not prevent the jury from considering any relevant mitigating evidence in the case in view of an instruction that the jury arrive at its verdict based on all the evidence. (Franklin v. Lynaugh (1988) 487 U.S. ___, [101 L.Ed.2d 155, 159-160].) Pursuant to California Penal Code section 190.3, petitioner's jury was expressly invited to consider other extenuating circumstances.

The California Supreme Court, after reviewing the record of the penalty phase in its entirety, concluded for three reasons that the jurors were not misled by the language challenged by petitioner. First, although the prosecutor referred briefly to the instruction's mandatory sentencing language in closing argument, he clearly acknowledged the jurors were to make the decision. Second, the prosecutor emphasized the

jurors alone were to determine whether the death penalty was appropriate. Third, the court instructed the jurors pursuant to Hamilton's request that "in weighing the aggravating and mitigating factors, you are not to merely count numbers on either side. You are instructed rather to weigh and consider the factors on each side as a whole;" and, "in order to impose a death sentence, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the totality of the aggravating circumstances outweigh[s] the totality of the mitigating circumstances." (People v. Hamilton, supra, 45 Cal.3d at p. 371.)

The California Supreme Court acknowledged the phrase "shall impose a sentence of death" might "leave room for some confusion as to the jury's role," but has rejected the claim that the 1978 statute unconstitutionally authorized a mandatory death penalty. (People v. Brown (1985) 40 Cal.3d 512, 545; reversed on other grounds in California v. Brown (1987) 479 U.S. 538.) The California Supreme Court has further held that a death judgment is invalid under the Eighth Amendment if imposed by a sentencer that believed it lacked ultimate moral responsibility to determine what penalty is appropriate under all the circumstances of the case. (People v. Melton (1988) 44 Cal.3d 713, 761.) At the same time, jurors are not to receive such unbridled discretion that arbitrary decisions are likely. (Furman v. Georgia (1972) 408 U.S. 238.)

Here, the jury was told pursuant to CALJIC No. 8.84.1 (penalty trial -- factors for consideration)[7] To consider any

7. CALJIC No. 8.84.1, as given in the instant case, provided:

> "In determining which penalty is to be imposed on the defendant, you shall consider all of the evidence which has been received during any part of the trial of this case. You shall consider, take into account and be guided by the following factors, if applicable:
>
> "(a) The circumstances of the crime of which the defendant was convicted in the present proceeding and the existence of any special circumstances found to be true.
>
> "(b) The presence or absence of criminal activity by the defendant which involved the use or attempted use of force or violence or the expressed or implied

circumstances which extenuated the gravity of the crime even though it was not a legal excuse for the crime. (RT 4662-4664.) Consideration of compassion as a mitigating factor was, therefore, expressly allowed. A review of Lockett v. Ohio (1978) 438 U.S. 586, demonstrates why this instruction was constitutionally appropriate.

Lockett v. Ohio, supra, in a plurality opinion held that the Ohio death penalty statute was unconstitutional under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution because the statute required the death penalty where one or more factors in aggravation were proven unless outweighed by evidence in mitigation, which had to fit within one of three

---

threat to use force or violence.

"(c) The presence or absence of any prior felony conviction.

"(d) Whether or not the offense was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance.

"(e) Whether or not the victim was a participant in the defendant's homicidal conduct or consented to the homicidal act.

"(f) Whether or not the offense was committed under circumstances which the defendant reasonably believed to be a moral justification or expectation for his conduct.

"(g) Whether or not the defendant acted under extreme duress or under the substantial domination of another person.

"(h) Whether or not at the time of the offense the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was impaired as a result of mental disease or defect or the affects of intoxication.

"(i) The age of the defendant at the time of the crime.

"(j) Whether or not the defendant was an accomplice to the offense and his participation in the commission of the offense was relatively minor.

"(k) Any other circumstance which extenuates the gravity of the crime even though it is not a legal excuse for the crime." (See, Cal. Pen. Code, § 190.3.)

Pursuant to CALJIC No. 8.84.2, the jury was also told it "shall" impose death if aggravating circumstances outweighed mitigating circumstances and "shall" impose life without possibility of parole if mitigating circumstances outweigh aggravating circumstances. (See, Cal. Pen. Code, § 190.3.)

specific categories. Lockett compared the Ohio statute with those upheld in Gregg v. Georgia (1976) 428 U.S. 153, and Proffitt v. Florida (1976) 428 U.S. 242, and found that the Ohio Statute, in contrast to those in Gregg and Proffitt, violated the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments since it precluded the consideration as a mitigating factor of any relevant aspect of the defendant's character or record or any of the circumstances of the offense. (Lockett v. Ohio, supra, at pp. 604-607.)

In contrast to the instruction in Lockett v. Ohio, supra, the jury instruction in the instant case, CALJIC No. 8.84.1, meets the constitutional standards set forth in Lockett, supra. The Ohio statute in Lockett contained eight fewer categories and completely lacked the kind of catchall category contained in section (k). In its first sentence, CALJIC No. 8.84.1 instructs the jury that the mitigating factors are essentially unlimited since they can be derived from "all of the evidence which has been received during any part of the trial of this case. . . ." (Emphasis added.) In addition, the eleventh of the special categories given to the jury (section (k)) is a broad catchall category providing that the jury can consider "any other circumstance which extenuates the gravity of the crime even though it is not a legal excuse for the crime." (Emphasis added.) These factors necessarily include the offender and compassion.

Furthermore, California v. Ramos (1983) 463 U.S. 992, found no constitutional infirmity in California Penal Code section 190.3. Since the wording of that code section is identical to the wording of CALJIC No. 8.84.1(k), the instruction does not violate Lockett. The language of the instruction necessarily allows the jury to consider the offender and compassion since the jury sets the penalty after considering mitigating factors drawn from all evidence and "any other circumstance" extenuating the gravity of the crime.

Thus, unlike the situation in Lockett, in California the jury can consider any of the evidence presented at any phase

of the trial and any extenuating circumstance as factors in mitigation. Certainly, compassion and the individual worth of the defendant fall within this catchall category of section (k). The instruction allowed the jury to treat petitioner as an individual. (See, Lockett v. Ohio, supra, 438 U.S. at p. 605.) It did not prevent the jury from considering any relevant, mitigating evidence in the case. (See, Franklin v. Lynaugh, supra, 101 L.Ed.2d at p. 160.) Thus, there was no risk the death penalty would be imposed in spite of the hypothetical existence of factors allegedly calling for a less severe penalty.

Petitioner objects to use of the word "shall" in CALJIC No. 8.84.2, claiming that word somehow creates a duty to return a verdict of death. However, "shall" is also used in the portion of the instruction dealing with life confinement. (RT 4703.) Use of "shall" equally to describe both options could not possibly be misconstrued by a reasonable juror to mean one option should be chosen over the other. Moreover, use of "shall" merely mirrors the language of Penal Code section 190.3, which states the trier of fact shall take into account various relevant factors. Petitioner's contention such language may create a situation where the jury is obligated to impose the death penalty when it finds the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances, even though it does not believe the aggravation is sufficient to justify death, makes no sense. Initially, it would be factually impossible for a jury to conclude the aggravating circumstances outweighed the mitigating circumstances and yet subjectively feel the death penalty was not warranted. Under CALJIC No. 8.84.1(k) the jury could consider any fact it wished to mitigate the crime and not impose the judgment of death. Given this fact, it is absurd to suggest that in spite of subsection (k), the jury would find the aggravating circumstances outweighed the mitigating circumstances and then still decide the death penalty was inappropriate.

Moreover, any modification to the instruction here would probably violate the federal constitution. The whole point

of this Court's decisions in Gregg, Proffitt, and Jurek (Gregg v. Georgia, supra, 428 U.S. 153; Proffitt v. Florida, supra, 428 U.S. 242; Jurek v. Texas (1976) 428 U.S. 262), is that the decision to impose death must be guided in a specific way and cannot be arbitrary and capricious. (See, Barclay v. Florida (1983) 463 U.S. 939.) However, petitioner's suggestion that the jury be allowed free reign to decide what penalty is appropriate after it finds the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances would result in arbitrary and capricious decision making. This is improper.

Consequently, it is perfectly proper to give the jury consideration of a broad scope of evidence, give it various categories of aggravating and mitigating circumstances, and then advise it that if it finds the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances it shall impose the death penalty. (Id.)

> ". . . [D]iscretion must be suitably directed and limited so as to minimize the risk of wholly arbitrary and capricious action." Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 189 (1976) . . . ." (Kant v. Stephens (1983) 462 U.S. 862, 874.)
>
> The language in CALJIC No. 8.84.2,
>
> ". . . was directly taken from the 1978 death penalty law and accurately describes the jury's function under that law: to weigh the applicable aggravating and mitigating factors and, on that basis, and that basis alone, to determine whether death is an appropriate remedy." (People v. Hendricks (1988) 44 Cal.3d 635, 654, emphasis in original.)

Thus, the court conceded that in People v. Myers (1987) 43 Cal.3d 250, it was perhaps unduly critical of the prosecutor's reliance upon the mandatory language of these standard instructions. (People v. Hendricks, supra.) Where the record demonstrates that the jury fully understood that it could assign whatever weight it thought appropriate to the factors in aggravation and mitigation

and that it should base its penalty determination on all of the evidence in the case, use of the word "shall" in the instructions and argument does not compel a finding that the jury was misled "from an otherwise assumed proper understanding of its duty to determine appropriateness of death through the weighing process." (Id., at p. 655.)

Thus, petitioner's contention in this regard is meritless. (See, People v. Harris (1981) 28 Cal.3d 935, 963-964.)

In sum, the penalty phase instructions invite consideration of compassion, are equally weighted in sentencing alternatives, adequately define terms, and provide guidelines which promote sentencing reliability.

CONCLUSION

Respondent respectfully requests that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General
of the State of California
STEVE WHITE, Chief Assistant
Attorney General
FREDERICK R. MILLAR, JR.,
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

Pat Zaharopoulos

PAT ZAHAROPOULOS,
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Respondent

PZ:ab
11/3/88
SD88XU0004

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Attorney:

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP
Attorney General of
the State of California
PAT ZAHAROPOULOS
Supervising Deputy
Attorney General

110 West A Street, Suite 700
San Diego, California 92101

No: 88-5746
October Term, 1988

BERNARD LEE HAMILTON

Petitioner,

v.

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Respondent.

I, THE UNDERSIGNED, say: I am a citizen of the United States, am 18 years of age or over, employed in the County of San Diego in which County the below stated mailing occurred, and not a party to the subject cause, my business address being 110 West A Street, Suite 700, San Diego, California 92101.

I have served the within BRIEF OF RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION as follows: To Joseph F. Spaniol, Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C. 20543, an original and nine (9) copies, of which a true and correct copy of the document filed in this cause is hereunto affixed; AND, by placing one copy in a separate envelope addressed for and to each addressee named as follows:

Barry L. Morris
Attorney at Law
580 Grand Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610

Each envelope was then sealed and with the postage prepaid deposited in the United States mail by me at San Diego, California, on the 1 day of November, 1988.

There is a delivery service by United States Mail at each place so addressed or regular communication by United States Mail between the place of mailing and each place so addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at San Diego, California, November, 9, 1988.

Anne Marie Buford
ANNE MARIE BUFORD

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 9th day of November, 1988.

BETTY A. HITCHINGHAM
NOTARY PUBLIC - CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
My commission expires Sept. 17, 1991

Betty A. Hitchingham
Notary Public in and for said County and State

APPENDIX 1-A

…gment by reducing the …ssibility of parole and …ie v. *Frierson* (1979) 25 … 587] (plur. opn.); see

[Crim. No. 21958. May 19, 1988.]

THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v.
BERNARD LEE HAMILTON, Defendant and Appellant.

[Crim. Nos. 25303, 8201870. May 19, 1988.]

In re BERNARD LEE HAMILTON on Habeas Corpus.

SUMMARY

Defendant was convicted of first degree murder (Pen. Code, § 187), kidnapping (Pen. Code, § 207), robbery (Pen. Code, § 211), and burglary (Pen. Code, § 459). He was found to have committed the murder in the course of robbery (Pen. Code, § 190.2, subd. (a)(17)(i)), kidnapping (§ 190.2, subd. (a)(17)(ii)), and burglary (§ 190, subd. (a)(17)(vii)). He was sentenced to death. (Superior Court of San Diego County, No. 47283, Franklin B. Orfield, Judge.)

On remand from the United States Supreme Court, following its vacation of the previous judgment which had reversed the death penalty for failure of the trial court to instruct that intent to kill was an element of the felony-murder special circumstances, the Supreme Court affirmed the judgment in its entirety, and denied two petitions for habeas corpus. The court held the cause in its entirety was properly before it, and adopted its prior decision dealing with guilt issues as its decision in the proceeding. It further held the trial court did not err in failing to instruct the jury that intent to kill was an element of the felony-murder special circumstances, and thus did not reach the issue, the subject of the United States Supreme Court's remand order, of whether a failure to instruct on intent was subject to harmless-error analysis. The court held that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's motion to represent himself which was made in the midst of the jury's guilt phase deliberations. It also held that under the circumstances of the case and in view of the whole record defendant was not prejudiced by potentially misleading instructions pertaining to the jury's sentencing responsibility and discretion. The court held that although the trial court erred in giving a so-called Briggs instruction relating to the Governor's commutation and pardon power, the error was not prejudicial in view of the

trial court's subsequent instructions and admonitions not to make any use of the instruction in determining the penalty to be imposed on defendant. On the habeas corpus petitions, the court held defendant failed to show he was denied effective representation of counsel, and also rejected his claim the prosecution interfered with his attempt to obtain evidence. (Opinion by Mosk, J., with Lucas, C. J., Panelli, Arguelles, Eagleson, and Kaufman, JJ. concurring. Separate concurring and dissenting opinion by Broussard, J.)

HEADNOTES

Classified to California Digest of Official Reports, 3d Series

(1) **Courts § 33—Decisions and Orders—Law of the Case—Supreme Court Vacation of Judgment Remand.**—Where, in a death penalty case, the United States Supreme Court granted the California Attorney General's petition for certiorari on a particular issue, vacated the judgment, and remanded to the California Supreme Court for further proceedings, the decision was rendered a nullity and as such had no binding force. The cause in its entirety was then before the California Supreme Court. Accordingly, the doctrine of law of the case did not bar reconsideration of any point decided in the first case. The doctrine may be applied only when and to the extent the prior decision had binding force.

(2) **Homicide § 79—Instructions—Nature and Elements of Offense—Intent to Kill—Special Circumstances—Felony Murder.**—In a capital murder prosecution, the trial court did not err in failing to instruct the jury that intent to kill was an element of the felony-murder special circumstance, where all the evidence showed that defendant either actually killed the victim or was not involved in the crime at all, and there was no evidence that he was an aider and abetter. An instruction on intent to kill is only required when there is evidence from which the jury could find that the defendant was an aider and abetter rather than the actual killer.

(3a, 3b) **Criminal Law § 87.3—Rights of Accused—Aid of Counsel—Self-representation—Timeliness of Motion—Capital Case.**—In a death penalty case, defendant's motion to represent himself, filed in the midst of the jury's guilt phase deliberations, was not timely for purposes of invoking the absolute right of self-representation. The penalty phase could not be considered a separate trial for purposes of the motion. The penalty phase has no separate formal existence but is

ions not to make any use
se imposed on defendant.
fendant failed to show he
ld also rejected his claim
ain evidence. (Opinion by
gleson, and Kaufman, JJ.
pinion by Broussard, J.)

d Series

of the Case—Supreme
here, in a death penalty
ted the California Attor-
rticular issue, vacated the
upreme Court for further
llity and as such had no
hem before the California
if law of the case did not
he first case. The doctrine
st the prior decision had

Elements of Offense—In-
ty Murder.—In a capital
r in failing to instruct the
he felony-murder special
ud that defendant either
id in the crime at all, and
nd abetter. An instruction
s evidence from which the
er and abetter rather than

d—Aid of Counsel—Self-
pital Case.—In a death
ent himself, filed in the
, was not timely for pur-
presentation. The penalty
trial for purposes of the
e formal existence but is

merely a stage in a unitary capital trial. Moreover, the connection between the phases of a capital trial is substantial and not merely formal.

(4) **Criminal Law § 87.2—Rights of Accused—Aid of Counsel—Self-representation—Denial of Motion—Discretion.**—The trial court in a capital case did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's untimely motion to represent himself, where, although the court considered irrelevant factors such as defendant's inability "to roam around the courtroom" in shackles and his lack of competence in law, it nevertheless made a reasonable determination, after considering the proper factors, that defendant should not be permitted to represent himself at the penalty phase of the trial.

(5) **Homicide § 101—Punishment—Death Penalty—Sentencing Formula.**—The sentencing formula of Pen. Code, § 190.3, is not unconstitutional on the asserted ground that it withdraws from the trier of fact constitutionally compelled discretion and thereby undermines the reliability of the verdict.

(6) **Criminal Law § 823—Punishment—Penalty Trial—Instructions—Mandatory Sentencing Language.**—In the penalty phase of a capital case, an instruction incorporating the mandatory sentencing language of Pen. Code, § 190.3, did not mislead the jurors to defendant's prejudice as to the scope of their sentencing responsibility and discretion in violation of constitutional principles. Although in closing argument the prosecutor referred briefly to the mandatory sentencing language, he clearly acknowledged the jurors' discretion and their individual responsibility. In his closing argument defense counsel emphasized it was the sole responsibility of the jurors to determine whether the death penalty was appropriate for defendant. Also, at defendant's request the court instructed the jurors on their proper function in weighing aggravating and mitigating factors.

[See Cal.Jur.3d (Rev), Criminal Law, § 3345; Am.Jur.2d, Homicide, § 555.]

(7) **Criminal Law § 823—Punishment—Penalty Trial—Instructions—Mitigating Factors.**—In the penalty phase of a capital case, a potentially misleading instruction on what the jury could consider in mitigation did not mislead the jury to defendant's prejudice. The jurors were in fact adequately informed that they could consider character and background evidence. After the defense presented a case that consisted entirely of such evidence, the court instructed the jurors that they

should not limit their consideration of mitigating circumstances to the specific statutory factors, but should consider any other circumstances presented as reasons for not imposing the death sentence.

(8) **Criminal Law § 823—Punishment—Penalty Trial—Instructions—Re Governor's Power to Commute or Modify.**—In the penalty phase of a capital case, the trial court erred in instructing the jury as to the Governor's commutation and pardon powers as to life sentences (Briggs instruction), and the error was not cured by a supplementary instruction that did not alter the objectionable language which continued to mislead and to invite speculation on irrelevant and improper matters. However, the error was not prejudicial, in view of the court's direction to the jurors not to make any use of the erroneous instruction in determining the penalty to be imposed on defendant. Jurors are presumed to follow the instructions given by the court. A brief and isolated comment by the prosecutor that defendant would spend his time in prison devising ways to manipulate the system and get out could not be understood to refer to the erroneous instruction: The remark did not even allude to the commutation power.

(9) **Criminal Law § 821—Punishment—Penalty Trial—Evidence—Invalid Special Circumstance.**—Even if one of three felony-murder special circumstances was invalid and improperly presented to the jury as evidence in aggravation in a capital case, no reversible error occurred, in view of the overwhelming evidence in aggravation and the minimal evidence in mitigation.

(10) **Homicide § 97—Verdict, Sentence, and Punishment—Capital Case—Power to Strike Special Circumstance Findings.**—Pen. Code, § 1385, authorizes the trial court to dismiss "in furtherance of justice" in any circumstance in which the legislative body has not clearly manifested a contrary intent. Thus, under the 1978 death penalty law, the trial court in a capital case had the authority to strike the special circumstance findings pursuant to § 1385.

(11) **Homicide § 101—Punishment—Death Penalty—Validity.**—Where, in view of the theories presented and the evidence introduced, the jury's guilt phase verdicts in a capital trial implied a finding that defendant was the actual killer, and where that finding was amply supported by the evidence, the imposition of the penalty of death on defendant did not violate U.S. Const., 8th Amend.

(12) **Criminal Law § 104—Rights of Accused—Competence of Defense Counsel—Burden of Proof.**—In order to establish a claim of

ng circumstances to the
ny other circumstances
leath sentence.

rial—Instructions—Re
n the penalty phase of a
ting the jury as to the
rs as to life sentences
red by a supplementary
language which contin-
rrelevant and improper
al, in view of the court's
f the erroneous instruc-
on defendant. Jurors are
the court. A brief and
ndant would spend his
the system and get out
neous instruction: The
ation power.

Trial—Evidence—In-
three felony-murder spe-
presented to the jury as
eversible error occurred,
svation and the minimal

Punishment—Capital
e Findings.—Pen. Code,
in furtherance of justice"
ve body has not clearly
1978 death penalty law,
ority to strike the special

uilty—Validity.—Where,
evidence introduced, the
l implied a finding that
that finding was amply
f the penalty of death on
Amend.

—Competence of Defense
o establish a claim of

ineffective assistance of counsel, a defendant must show that counsel performed at a level below an objective standard of reasonableness under prevailing professional norms; and thereby subjected the defense to prejudice, that is, in the absence of counsel's failings a more favorable outcome was reasonably probable.

(13) **Criminal Law § 104—Rights of Accused—Competence of Defense Counsel—Burden of Proof—Allegations.**—On appeal from a capital conviction, allegations by defendant that trial counsel made various errors in strategy and tactics and that they feared defendant and treated him with distrust, and that appellate counsel refused to argue that facial expressions and gestures trial counsel assertedly made during jury selection prejudiced the defense, failed to effectively allege either deficient performance or prejudice.

(14) **Criminal Law § 233—Trial—Power and Conduct of Judge—Bias.**—When the state of mind of the trial judge in a criminal trial appears to be adverse to one of the parties but is based on actual observance of the witnesses and evidence given during the trial of the action, it does not amount to prejudice.

(15) **Criminal Law § 48—Rights of Accused—Fair Trial—Presence at Trial—Scheduling Hearing.**—A defendant charged with capital crimes was not entitled to be present at a pretrial hearing to establish a schedule under which a defense criminologist would examine a vehicle involved in the murder. An accused is not entitled to be personally present on matters in which his presence does not bear a reasonably substantial relation to the fullness of his opportunity to defend against the charge. Defendant's attendance at what was essentially a scheduling hearing would not have been useful or of benefit to the defense.

(16) **Criminal Law § 45—Rights of Accused—Fair Trial—Distortion or Suppression of Evidence.**—A capital defendant's claim on habeas corpus that the prosecution interfered with his attempt to obtain evidence by having a van involved in the murder examined and cleaned before the defense criminologist could subject it to inspection and tests failed to adequately allege interference, where it did not state that the criminologist acted without undue delay or that the delay on his part was attributable to the prosecution.

COUNSEL.

Barry L. Morris, under appointment by the Supreme Court, for Defendant, Appellant and Petitioner.

John K. Van de Kamp, Attorney General, Steve White, Chief Assistant Attorney General, Harley D. Mayfield, Assistant Attorney General, Jay M. Bloom, John W. Carney, Michael D. Wellington and Pat Zaharopoulos, Deputy Attorneys General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

OPINION

MOSK, J.—The cause in Crim. 21958 is before us on remand from the United States Supreme Court. It was last here on automatic appeal from a judgment of death. (Pen. Code, § 1239, subd. (b).) Defendant was convicted of first degree murder (*id.*, § 187), kidnapping (*id.*, § 207), robbery (*id.*, § 211), and burglary (*id.*, § 459). He was found to have committed the murder in the course of robbery (*id.*, § 190.2, subd. (a)(17)(i)), kidnapping (*id.*, subd. (a)(17)(ii)), and burglary (*id.*, subd. (a)(17)(vii)). He admitted that he had previously suffered convictions for forgery (*id.*, § 470) and for two counts of burglary (*id.*, § 459). He was sentenced to death.

When the cause was previously before us we held there was no reversible error at the guilt phase of the trial, but that under the general rule of automatic reversal of *People* v. *Garcia* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 539 [205 Cal.Rptr. 265, 684 P.2d 826], the court's failure to instruct in accordance with *Carlos* v. *Superior Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131 [197 Cal.Rptr. 79, 672 P.2d 862], that intent to kill was an element of the felony-murder special circumstances, required the setting aside of the special circumstance findings and hence the reversal of the judgment of death. (*People* v. *Hamilton* (1985) 41 Cal.3d 408 [221 Cal.Rptr. 902, 710 P.2d 981] [*Hamilton I*].)

After seeking rehearing in this court without success, the Attorney General petitioned the United States Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari. The court granted the petition, ordered our judgment vacated, and remanded the cause for reconsideration in light of its decision in *Ross* v. *Clark* (1986) 478 U.S. 570 [92 L.Ed.2d 460, 106 S.Ct. 3101].

Subsequently, defendant in propria persona filed two petitions for writ of habeas corpus. (Crim. 25303 and S001870.) We consolidate the cause in Crim. 21958 and the proceedings in Crim. 25303 and S001870 for purposes of decision.

As we shall explain, we conclude, as we concluded in *Hamilton I*, that the judgment must be affirmed as to guilt. Contrary to our determination in *Hamilton I*, we now conclude that the special circumstance findings must be upheld under *People* v. *Anderson* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1104, 1147 [240

Steve White, Chief Assistant
ant Attorney General, Jay M.
gton and Pat Zaharopoulos,
f Respondent.

fore us on remand from the
: on automatic appeal from a
'b).) Defendant was convicted
ng (*id.*, § 207), robbery (*id.*,
und to have committed the
mbd. (a)(17)(i)), kidnapping
d. (a)(17)(vii)). He admitted
r forgery (*id.*, § 470) and for
sentenced to death.

held there was no reversible
st under the general rule of
36 Cal.3d 539 [205 Cal.Rptr.
ect in accordance with *Carlos*
Cal.Rptr. 79, 672 P.2d 862],
lony-murder special circum-
al circumstance findings and
People v. *Hamilton* (1985) 41
81] [*Hamilton I*].)

st success, the Attorney Gen-
rt for a writ of certiorari. The
ment vacated, and remanded
sion in *Rose* v. *Clark* (1986)
101].

filed two petitions for writ of
We consolidate the cause in
903 and S001870 for purposes

ncluded in *Hamilton I*, that
trary to our determination in
l circumstance findings must
43 Cal.3d 1104, 1147 [240

Cal.Rptr. 585, 742 P.2d 1306], the court was not obligated to instruct on intent to kill with regard to the special circumstances here; and defendant does not present any other ground for setting aside the findings. We also conclude that the judgment must be affirmed as to penalty. Finally, we conclude that the petitions for writ of habeas corpus must be denied.

I. DIRECT APPEAL (CRIM. 21958)

A. *The Facts*

The facts of this case, which appear in *Hamilton I* at pages 413 to 419 of 41 Cal.3d, are relevant to our decision and are accordingly quoted in extenso below.

The evidence presented in the prosecution's case-in-chief tells the following tale. "On May 31, 1979, about 1 P.M., the body of Eleanore Frances Buchanan was discovered in the grass near a cul-de-sac off Pine Valley Road, near San Diego. Harry Piper noticed it while walking back to his car from target shooting. The body had no head or hands and was clothed only in a bra, underpants and socks.

"The body appeared to be in full rigor mortis when a deputy sheriff arrived at the scene between 1:30 and 2 p.m. Two strings of white cord were tied around the ankles, and there were dark blue fibers sticking to some blood on the body. There were marks on the wrists indicating that they had been tied together. A search of the area revealed no clothing or anything else that could be associated with the victim.

"Dr. Luibel, who performed the autopsy, was unable to determine the cause of death because of the absence of the head. (The head and hands have never been found.) He could, however, rule out natural causes. There were three long superficial incisions on the abdomen that appeared to have been inflicted after death. There was a horizontal stab wound on the abdomen that had probably been inflicted before death, but it did not penetrate the stomach or intestines. The right hand appeared to have been sawed off and the left one cut off with a knife. The head was probably removed by using both a knife and saw. Dr. Luibel could not say whether the victim was alive or dead when her head was cut off. The small amount of hemorrhage at the wrists suggested the victim was probably dead when her hands were cut off. The body was still in full rigor mortis at 4 p.m. on May 31, 1979, when Dr. Luibel examined it. Death would have occurred about 16 hours before then—about midnight the night before.

"Terry Buchanan, the victim's husband, testified that his wife had given birth to a baby boy three weeks before her death and that she was still

nursing him on May 30, 1979. That day Mrs. Buchanan left the house about 6:30 p.m. to go to a math class at Mesa College from 7 to 10 p.m. She was wearing tan levis, a beige and brown T-shirt, and was carrying a brown simulated leather purse. Mrs. Buchanan drove the family's only vehicle—a new blue van. There was very little gas in the tank because Buchanan planned to have the tank replaced the next day. Since Buchanan used the van during the day for his dental supply sales work, the van contained dental equipment and supplies. Buchanan said his wife was very security conscious and customarily locked the van. He also said that everything in the van was in good condition when she left.

"Mrs. Buchanan was last seen alive walking toward the parking lot from her math class about 9:30 p.m. Fellow students had given her copies of class notes for the classes she had missed because of the birth of her baby. Mrs. Buchanan had left class a little early because an optional quiz was given at 9:30 p.m.

"At 1:52 a.m. (California time) on May 31, 1979, defendant called his girlfriend, Donna Hatch, in Terrell, Texas from his parents' home in San Diego. He told Donna that he had a van and was planning to leave for Texas as soon as the gas stations opened in the morning.

"There was a gasoline shortage at the time, and gas stations were only open for limited hours. Between 4:45 a.m. and 10:15 a.m. on May 31, 1979, defendant used Terry and Eleanore Buchanan's Visa card to buy gas in El Cajon, California. The card was used two more times that day to buy gas for the van—once in El Centro, California at a station that was open between 6 a.m. and 10 a.m., and once in Tucson, Arizona.

"When defendant arrived at Donna Hatch's home in Terrell, Texas on the evening of June 1, 1979, the van was dirty, had a broken arm on the driver's chair, a broken mirror, and a broken wing window on the passenger side. Defendant took Donna with him on errands in the van on June 1, 2 and 3, 1979. Donna saw some credit cards in the name of Terry and Eleanore Buchanan in the compartment between the seats. Defendant used the credit cards to buy gas and food while Donna was with him.

"On June 3, while Donna was in the van with defendant and her daughter, they saw a highway patrolman. When Donna turned back to talk to her daughter, defendant told her not to make any sudden moves because they could get shot. Later, defendant stopped at a pay phone to call his brother and his friend Clifford. Donna heard defendant tell his brother he had flown to Texas. Clifford testified that when defendant called him, he was watching a report on TV that the body of a white woman with her head and hands

Buchanan left the house about
ge from 7 to 10 p.m. She was
t, and was carrying a brown
e the family's only vehicle—a
the tank because Buchanan
lay. Since Buchanan used the
iles work, the van contained
id his wife was very security
e also said that everything in
ft.

g toward the parking lot from
s had given her copies of class
f the birth of her baby. Mrs.
an optional quiz was given at

1, 1979, defendant called his
om his parents' home in San
d was planning to leave for
o the morning.

s, and gas stations were only
10:15 a.m. on May 31, 1979,
's Visa card to buy gas in El
ee times that day to buy gas
at a station that was open
Tucson, Arizona.

's home in Terrell, Texas on
ty, had a broken arm on the
ving window on the passenger
nds in the van on June 1, 2
in the name of Terry and
en the seats. Defendant used
Donna was with him.

th defendant and her daugh-
ime turned back to talk to her
r sudden moves because they
pay phone to call his brother
l tell his brother he had flown
called him, he was watching
ne with her head and hands

cut off had been found, he told defendant about it. Defendant seemed nervous when he returned from talking to Clifford. He told Donna that he thought he had killed a man, but he did not want to tell her any details because she might not want to have anything to do with him if he told her. Defendant said he would let the van sit a while to see if anybody paid attention to it. He also said he needed some Texas license plates. He asked Donna to go with him to a car lot, but she refused.

"Donna broke up with defendant the next day. Defendant said that if Donna were upset about the fact that he had lied about his ex-wife being dead, he would kill his ex-wife. On June 6, defendant called Donna to discuss bringing her back to California to testify for him in a pending case. At one point, a friend of Donna's got on the phone. Defendant told Donna, 'I'm going to kill you and your friend, too. And you won't know when I'll be around because I don't have to be driving this van, I can be in another vehicle.' Donna never saw or talked to defendant after that phone call.

"Defendant continued using the Buchanans' credit cards to buy gas, food and other items. It was stipulated that on June 6 defendant charged a saw, screwdriver and set of wrenches at a local store, and on June 7, he bought a butcher knife and two skeins of twine at a variety store.

"While driving the van in Oklahoma on June 8, 1979, defendant was stopped by a deputy sheriff. The deputy ran a check of the van's VIN number and learned that it belonged to the homicide victim. Defendant was arrested and taken to jail. On the way to the jail he passed a poster offering a reward for David L. Wall, alias 'Spider.'

"On June 9, 1979, San Diego sheriff's deputies interviewed defendant in Oklahoma. They began by introducing themselves, saying that they had come to talk to defendant about the van. Defendant interrupted them, stating: 'Yeah, the guy told me yesterday, one that pulled the gun on me, that it had been involved in a homicide, and uh . . . .' Defendant was then advised of his *Miranda* rights, which he waived. Defendant told the deputies he had left San Diego in the van with Spider and Fran, a white woman who had left her husband for Spider. Spider's real name was Calvin Spencer. Fran and Spider were presently in Shreveport, Louisiana. They had given defendant the van and credit cards when he had said he did not want to stay in Louisiana. Defendant was shown a picture of Eleanore Buchanan with her baby. He said it looked like Fran, but Fran was a little skinnier.[1]

[1] At this point the opinion notes: "Fran was Eleanore Buchanan's nickname. It was on the release papers she had been carrying and on an enumerated birth announcement that had been in her purse." (41 Cal.3d at p. 416, fn. 2.)

Defendant said 'the only time I seen her' Fran was wearing light colored jeans and carrying a beige zoomother purse.

"Enroute to San Diego, defendant was disturbed about his arrest for murder and kept saying it was not going to stick because all the police had was a body they could not identify and a runaway wife."[2]

"Shortly after defendant's preliminary hearing, Terry Buchanan received a letter with defendant's county jail return address. It said, 'You are probably full of grief when you should be highly pissed-off . . .' because Fran was not dead but had left with Spider and was smoking Sherman Sticks. Buchanan turned the letter over to the district attorney's office.

"Steven Thomas, an inmate at the San Diego County jail, testified that on January 24, 1980, he had a conversation with defendant about his case. He asked defendant, 'Who are you trying to convince, Hamilton, me or yourself?' Defendant replied, 'Well, I did it but they'll never prove it.' Thomas reported the conversation to the guard. Thomas had been convicted of murder, robbery, forgery, burglary and escape. Thomas testified he was in the federal witness protection program against organized crime, but had not received any money from the United States with respect to that program.

"While transporting defendant between the jail and courtroom on August 21, 1979, Deputy Sheriff Parsons was tightening defendant's security chains. Defendant said, 'All right, you have your fun, I'll have mine later.' Parsons responded, 'I thought you already had your fun.' Defendant replied, 'Yeah, and I'll kill a lot more, too, and you may be first on my list.'

"Brandon Armstrong, a criminalist, testified that the blue fibers that had been on the victim's body could easily have come from the carpet in the victim's van. Blood on the carpet in the van matched the type and characteristics of the victim. Several hairs found in the carpet stains could have been hers. Armstrong also examined blood found on defendant's shoe and concluded that it had been smeared on when wet. The blood on defendant's shoe was type O—the victim's type.[3] Defendant's type was A.

"A questioned documents expert testified that defendant was the person who had signed Terry Buchanan's name to the credit card invoices." (41 Cal.3d at pp. 413-417.)

[2] At this point the opinion notes: "The body was, in fact, quickly identified by a number of distinctive features, which included moles, toenail polish, scars, recent appendectomy, and the morning bra." (41 Cal.3d at p. 416, fn. 3.)

[3] At this point the opinion notes: "Armstrong testified on rebuttal that that blood on defendant's shoe could not have come from rubbing against the blood on the van's carpet." (41 Cal.3d at p. 417, fn. 4.)

The defense case was as follows. "Defendant's mother testified that he was at her house between 8 and 9 p.m. on May 30, 1979. She said that although she testified at the preliminary hearing that she did not remember seeing defendant on the evening of May 30, 1979, she later spoke to defendant who refreshed her recollection by reminding her of some things that had happened that evening.[5]

"Mary Brower, a relative of defendant's who lived in Oklahoma City testified that defendant had visited her in the early part of June 1979. He gave her a ride in the van, and she did not remember seeing any blood in it.

"Defendant testified that he had never seen the victim alive or dead. He said he went to his sister-in-law's house after he left his parent's house about 9 p.m. on May 30, 1979. He saw the Buchanans' van parked on a street between 12:45 and 1 a.m. on May 31, 1979, while walking home from a 7-Eleven store after talking to Butch McIntyre.[6] The keys were in the ignition, the wing window was broken, and a purse was on the passenger seat. Defendant drove the van home, called Donna Hatch, put his clothes in it and left for Texas shortly before sunrise. Defendant said he broke the armrest on the driver's seat when he was moving from the passenger seat to the driver's seat. (The seats were swivel chairs with armrests.)

"Defendant explained that he had told the officers in Oklahoma that he had driven across the country with Spider and Fran because he did not want to get stuck with an auto theft charge.

"Defendant denied having threatened to kill Donna Hatch. He said he bought the saw and other items on June 6 before he spoke to Donna Hatch. He planned to use them to burglarize a store in Terrell. Defendant said he was attempting to distract Donna when he told her he thought he had killed someone; she was angry at him because she had just found out he had lied about his ex-wife being dead.

"David Faulkner, an entomologist, testified about an experiment he had conducted in an attempt to determine when the victim's body had been left at the cul-de-sac. Faulkner took a rabbit, with its head and forepaws severed, and at midnight put it where the victim had been found. The purpose was to determine the amount of insect activity that would occur. Faulkner

[5] At this point the opinion notes: "Defendant had written two letters to Donna Hatch after her preliminary hearing testimony attempting to refresh her recollection as to events that involved her." (41 Cal.3d at p. 417, fn. 5.)

[6] At this point the opinion notes: "McIntyre testified he saw defendant after watching the NBA game on TV. There had, however, been no game on May 30. There had been one on May 29, 1979." (41 Cal.3d at p. 418, fn. 6.)

testified that within a few hours of sunrise there were a lot of flies around the rabbit. Based on this experiment and his knowledge of the temperature on the morning of May 31, 1979, Faulkner concluded that the earliest the body would have been put there would have been 9 a.m. Faulkner admitted, however, that there is a great deal of variation in the degree to which insects are attracted to different human bodies.

"Parker Bell, a criminalist, testified that the blood on defendant's shoe was a smear, as opposed to a droplet or splatter. He thought the blood could have come from the carpet, but he acknowledged that there were no blue fibers in the blood. (The blue carpet shed badly.) On cross-examination, however, Bell admitted it was possible that the blood could have been smeared on defendant's shoe by having bumped one of the victim's bloody stumps.

"Dr. Ali Hamoli, Chief Medical Examiner of the State of Delaware, testified that in his opinion the victim died between 9:30 and 12 p.m. on May 30. Dr. Hamoli also thought that rigor mortis was present when the body was placed at the cul-de-sac and that the body could have been put there no earlier than 4 a.m. on May 31.

"Allen Biggs testified that he had been at the cul-de-sac about 10 a.m. on May 31, 1979. He had seen Mr. Piper's car but no body. Deputy Sheriff Crawford testified that tire tracks at the scene in the cul-de-sac did not match the tire tracks of the victim's van.[7]" (41 Cal.3d at pp. 417-419.)

B. *Hamilton I*

In *Hamilton I*, we considered the issues going to guilt raised by defendant and concluded that none required reversal. (41 Cal.3d at pp. 419-431.) We also concluded that in violation of our decision in *Carlos v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 35 Cal.3d 131, the court failed to instruct the jury that intent to kill was an element of the felony-murder special circumstances. (41 Cal.3d at p. 431.) Further, we concluded that this error fell within the scope of the rule of automatic reversal laid down in *People v. Garcia*, *supra*, 36 Cal.3d 539, and outside the four narrow exceptions enunciated in that opinion. Specifically, we determined that only the so-called *Cantrell-Thornton* exception was potentially available (*People v. Cantrell* (1973) 8 Cal.3d 672 [105 Cal.Rptr. 792, 504 P.2d 1256]; *People v. Thornton* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 738 [114 Cal.Rptr. 467, 523 P.2d 267])—viz., that intent to kill was established as a matter of law and there was no contrary evidence worthy of consider-

[7] At this point the opinion notes: "Crawford had testified for the prosecution and had identified photos that showed drag marks from the roadway to where the body had been found. The drag marks appeared to start on the pavement." (41 Cal.3d at p. 419, fn. 7.)

here were a lot of flies around
knowledge of the temperature
concluded that the earliest the
een 9 a.m. Faulkner admitted,
in the degree to which insects

he blood on defendant's shoe
latter. He thought the blood
owledged that there were no
ed badly.) On cross-examina-
at the blood could have been
ed one of the victim's bloody

r of the State of Delaware,
etween 9:30 and 12 p.m. on
portis was present when the
e body could have been put

cul-de-sac about 10 a.m. on
ot no body. Deputy Sheriff
e in the cul-de-sac did not
(41 Cal.3d at pp. 417-419.)

to guilt raised by defendant
Cal.3d at pp. 419-431.) We
in *Carlos v. Superior Court*,
e jury that intent to kill
rcumstances. (41 Cal.3d at
fall within the scope of the
v. Green, *supra*, 36 Cal.3d
enunciated in that opinion.
nd *Caswell-Thornton* excep-
ll (1973) 8 Cal.3d 672 [105
rnton (1974) 11 Cal.3d 738
ntent to kill was established
vidence worthy of consider-

For the prosecution and had elec-
where the body had been found
d.3d at p. 419, fn. 5.)

ation. We thus determined that the evidence adduced at trial showed that the exception was in fact not available here. Accordingly, we vacated the special circumstance findings and reversed the judgment as to penalty.

Thereupon the Attorney General filed his petition for a writ of certiorari on the issue whether the failure to instruct on intent to kill with regard to a felony-murder special circumstance is subject to harmless-error analysis. The high court granted the petition, vacated the judgment in *Hamilton I*, and remanded the cause to this court for further consideration in light of its decision in *Ross v. Clark*, *supra*, 478 U.S. 570 [92 L.Ed.2d 460, 106 S.Ct. 3101].

C. *The Cause on Remand*

At the threshold, we must delineate the scope of review on remand.

(1) Contrary to the parties' assumption, the cause in its entirety is properly before us. This is so because the United States Supreme Court vacated the judgment in *Hamilton I* and rendered the decision a nullity. Also contrary to the parties' assumption, the doctrine of law of the case does not bar reconsideration of any point decided in *Hamilton I*. The doctrine may be applied only when and to the extent the prior decision has binding force. (*See City of Oakland v. Oakland W. Ets. Co.* (1912) 162 Cal. 675, 677-678 [124 P. 251] [prior decision binding on points concurred in by the requisite number of judges, not binding on others].) Because the judgment in *Hamilton I* was vacated, that decision, of course, is a nullity and as such has no binding force.

1. *Guilt Issues*

Pursuant to the mandate of the United States Supreme Court referred to above, we have reexamined that part of our former opinion dealing with the issues relating to guilt. (*Hamilton I*, *supra*, 41 Cal.3d at pp. 419-431.) Inasmuch as we deem it unnecessary to alter or amend our prior decision in that regard, we adopt it as our decision in this proceeding.

2. *Special Circumstance Issues*

(2) Renewing the point he made in *Hamilton*, defendant contends the court erred by failing to instruct the jury that intent to kill was an element of the felony-murder special circumstance. The claim must be rejected.

In *People v. Anderson*, *supra*, 43 Cal.3d at page 1147, we held that the court must instruct on intent when there is evidence from which the jury

could find that the defendant was an aider and abettor rather than the actual killer. In this case, of course, all the evidence showed that defendant either actually killed Buchanan or was not involved in the crime at all; there was no evidence that he was an aider and abettor. Thus, the court did not err by failing to instruct on intent.

Since we have concluded that the court was not obligated to instruct on intent, we are not required to reach the issue to which the high court's remand order directed us—i.e., whether the failure to instruct on intent is subject to harmless-error analysis—and accordingly decline to do so.[*]

3. *Penalty Issues*

At the penalty phase the prosecution presented evidence to show that defendant, who was 29 years of age at the time of trial in 1981, had been involved in serious criminal activity virtually all his adult life. It was stipulated that defendant had suffered felony convictions for the following offenses: a 1971 forgery, two 1972 burglaries, a 1976 auto theft, and a 1976 Louisiana burglary.

The prosecution presented evidence that defendant robbed one Ruth Story on November 17, 1976. On that date, Story was about 55 years old and walked with a cane. As she was returning home from a store, she encountered a man and woman whom she did not know. The man knocked her to the ground and attempted to take her purse from her shoulder; she tried to get up, he pulled her into the street, she again tried to get up, he again knocked her to the ground and then pulled her onto the sidewalk, took her purse, struck her three times in the face with his fist causing serious injuries, and thereupon fled with his woman companion.

While he was in custody in Louisiana for his 1976 burglary, defendant wrote to Officer Patrick Blow of the San Diego Police Department. In his letter he complained that the Louisiana authorities had "railroaded" him and were subjecting him to physical abuse; stated that he wished to return to the San Diego area; confessed to the Story robbery; and requested that Blow urge the district attorney to have him extradited.

Subsequently, the San Diego police showed Story a photographic lineup in which defendant's picture appeared. Story identified defendant as the

[*]Defendant also contends the felony-murder-burglary special-circumstance finding must be set aside on the ground that the death penalty law does not include the burglary of a vehicle within the scope of this special circumstance. Because he has failed to show that the other special circumstance findings are invalid on any ground, defendant is properly death-eligible. (Pen. Code, § 190.2, subd. (a).) Hence, we need not reach this issue.

er and shelter rather than the evidence showed that defendant volved in the crime at all; there better. Thus, the court did not

as not obligated to instruct on ase to which the high court's failure to instruct on intent is cordingly declines to do so."

ounted evidence to show that time of trial in 1981, had been all his adult life. It was stipo- convictions for the following , a 1976 auto theft, and a 1976

defendant robbed one Ruth Story was about 55 years old ting home from a store, she 5 not know. The man knocked purse from her shoulder; she she again tried to get up, he pulled her onto the sidewalk, his face with his fist causing a woman companion.

his 1976 burglary, defendant go Police Department. In his victim had "railroaded" him ated that he wished to return r robbery, and requested that e extradited.

Story a photographic lineup e identified defendant as the

r special-circumstance finding must e not include the burglary of a vehi- he has failed to show that the other defendant is properly death-eligible. e this issue.

perpetrator, stating she was "about 80 percent certain." At a live lineup, however, Story failed to identify defendant as the perpetrator. She similarly failed to identify him at the preliminary hearing. Nevertheless, defendant was held to answer.

Not long after the preliminary hearing, defendant wrote to Story. In his letter he stated, "I know you don't know me personally, but I am the man accused in that November 1976 incident where you were robbed and hurt." He then said that he had made the confession in his letter to Officer Brow solely to be extradited from Louisiana, and that the confession was not true. Finally, he asked her help in clearing him of the robbery charge.

A few days later, defendant wrote to the San Diego District Attorney. In his letter, he said that he had made his confession as a result of coercion and was innocent of the robbery charge, and that it was in the office's best interests to dismiss the case. He added: "Your victim definitely knows me Personally and intimately. Back in 1967-68 and '69, when I was just a young buck, she used to pay me for my sexual services. . . . She is an alcoholic and sex freak, which is no crime, but the fact is, she knows me and would therefore would [sic] know if I was the one who robbed her, of [sic] which she has already said I wasn't."

At the penalty phase, Story identified defendant as her assailant. She stated: "The way [defendant] sets his mouth looks very much the same as the man set his mouth when he hit me."

The prosecution called one Rosie Blackmon to prove that she had twice suffered battery at defendant's hands. Blackmon testified that from late 1978 to early 1979 she and defendant were lovers; she worked driving a taxi cab, and was studying to become a truck driver; the pair discussed marriage, but defendant stated he did not want his wife to drive trucks; one morning in February 1979, defendant prevented her from going to truck driver school by beating her about the head with his fist, and she subsequently ended their relationship; a couple of weeks later, defendant accosted her at her place of employment, she responded she had nothing to say to him, and he then knocked her down with a punch to the head and proceeded to kick her head, face, and arms.

The prosecution also presented evidence that on the morning of October 8, 1980, deputy sheriffs made a number of unsuccessful attempts to get defendant out of bed to attend trial; finally, defendant jumped to his feet, raised his fists to the deputies, resisted their efforts to take him to court, pulled observation, and spat in one deputy's face. Defendant attempted to show that he had been provoked and was subjected to excessive force.

In its case, the defense presented evidence to portray defendant a human being and thereby move the jury to exercise mercy. In substance evidence presented consisted of the testimony of family members friends who asked that the jury spare defendant's life. These witne recalled defendant's religious upbringing, spoke of his human side, recounted how he had been affected by the death of his younger brot

a. Right to Self-representation

Defendant contends that he was denied his constitutional right to rep sent himself at the penalty phase in violation of *Faretta* v. *California* (19 422 U.S. 806 [45 L.Ed.2d 562, 95 S.Ct. 2525]. Specifically, he claims court erred by denying a motion he filed on December 27, 1980, in which requested that the court "relieve counsel or in the alternative permit defe sent [to] represent himself."

To properly address the contention, we must summarize certain even that occurred before the court made the ruling at issue. Evidently at a raignment on July 12, 1979, Patrick O'Connor was appointed to represe defendant. On September 25, 1979, on defendant's motion O'Connor w relieved on the ground of incompatibility, and Jerome Wallingford w appointed in his place. On November 7, 1979, dissatisfied with the represe tation that Wallingford was providing, defendant again made a motion relieve counsel; Wallingford joined in the motion; the court, however, d nied the request. On November 26, 1979, apparently on defendant's motio Wallingford was relieved and Thomas Ryan and Vivian Cumberg we appointed in his place. On May 1, 1980, defendant filed a motion requesti that the court relieve Ryan and Cumberg and permit him to represe himself. At a hearing on May 9, 1980, defendant withdrew his motion a made a new motion requesting that the court appoint him as cocounsel; t court granted this request. On May 20, 1980, defendant, complaining their performance, again moved to have Ryan and Cumberg relieved and be permitted to represent himself. Finding inter alia that defendant did have "a legitimate objection, but [was] only grasping at anything he co think of to delay the proceedings," the court denied the motion.

On October 2, 1980, trial commenced with jury selection. On October 1 1980, defendant again filed a motion to represent himself. On October 2 1980, however, he asked that his motion be taken off calendar, stating a follows: "I looked at the problems involved and I feel that [they are] most misinterpretations and misunderstandings that possibly could be worke out . . . . I don't want new counsel and then again I don't think pro. per. the answer to my problems I have right now." On November 3, 198 defendant revived his motion, claiming essentially that counsel's perfor

to portray defendant as a
cise mercy. In substance the
y of family members and
fant's life. These witnesses
ce of his human side, and
sth of his younger brother.

onstitutional right to repre-
Faretta v. *California* (1975)
Specifically, he claims the
imber 27, 1980, in which he
e alternative permit defend-

summarize certain events
g at issue. Evidently at ar-
was appointed to represent
nt's motion O'Connor was
Jerome Wallingford was
satisfied with the represen-
nt again made a motion to
m; the court, however, de-
ntly on defendant's motion
nd Vivian Camberg were
nt filed a motion requesting
permit him to represent
t withdrew his motion and
point him as cocounsel; the
defendant, complaining of
d Camberg relieved and to
alia that defendant did not
naping at anything he can
denied the motion.

y selection. On October 14,
nt himself. On October 20,
em off calendar, stating as
I feel that [they are] mostly
possibly could be worked
tin I don't think pro. per. is
." On November 3, 1980,
ally that counsel's perfor-

mance was inadequate in several particulars. Counsel responded with apparently satisfactory explanations on all counts. Finding inter alia that counsel "have done everything possible as far as I have been able to ascertain in the proper representation of Mr. Hamilton," and that defendant had a "proclivity to substitute counsel," the court denied the motion. Later that same day, the guilt phase began with preinstructions to the jury. On November 17, 1980, and December 8, 1980, defendant renewed his request to represent himself, each time without success. On December 9, 10, 12, and 15, 1980, defendant made a variety of complaints about counsel's performance, but was unable to persuade the court that any of them had merit. On December 16, 1980, the jury commenced deliberations.

On January 6, 1981, the jury returned its guilt phase verdicts and defendant filed the motion now in issue—viz., the request that "the court relieve counsel or in the alternative permit defendant [to] represent himself" during the penalty phase. The motion was based on the ground that counsel performed inadequately and failed to adopt the strategy and tactics defendant had proposed. That same day, the court appears to have summarily denied the motion.

At a hearing on January 15, 1981—five days before the penalty phase opened—defendant renewed his motion. Again, the court denied his request. In so ruling it stated as follows.

"I have had the opportunity to see this case from beginning to end and I think that Mr. Ryan and Miss Camberg have done an outstanding job in their representation of the defendant in the face of real adversity through Mr. Hamilton putting stumbling blocks in their path at almost every turn. [¶] It is almost as if Mr. Hamilton were attempting to sabotage his case. [¶] The complaints that Mr. Hamilton has made are, I find, totally and completely without merit.

"I think it would be a real travesty and a mockery if I were to permit Mr. Hamilton to represent himself. He has had violent confrontations with the deputies in the jail. He has had violent confrontations with other persons.

"I have found it necessary for Mr. Hamilton to be handcuffed and in shackles, in effect during the entire trial because I was, frankly, concerned about violence here in the courtroom, about his attacking anybody that might be immediately at hand, and I can assure you that I would be the most disturbed person in the world if I hadn't required that he be in shackles and somebody, either his attorneys or somebody close to Mr. Hamilton in the courtroom were seriously injured.

"I don't see that there is any change. I don't feel there is any change whatever in my feeling relative to Mr. Hamilton representing himself. He certainly can't represent himself, being in chains.

"Certainly, he'd be in an awfully awkward position to be attempting to roam around the courtroom with his exhibits in the condition he is in, and I am certainly not going to release him from the shackles during the balance of the trial.

"I can only say that Mr. Hamilton has done many things that he shouldn't have done during the course of the trial. He has seemed to, as I have indicated, put stumbling blocks in the path of his attorneys. He has made suggestions which were absolutely preposterous as far as trial tactics are concerned, and if he had followed those tactics, it would have been even, I mean, the result would have been absolutely disastrous from his standpoint of the presentation.

"I can't conceive of Mr. Hamilton representing himself in this final phase, the penalty phase of the trial, the portion of the trial which is going to determine whether he is sentenced to life imprisonment or whether he is sentenced to death. I think it would be a real travesty if I were to do otherwise."

In *People* v. *Windham* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 121 [137 Cal.Rptr. 8, 560 P.2d 1187], we held that "in order to invoke the constitutionally mandated unconditional right of self-representation a defendant in a criminal trial should make an unequivocal assertion of that right within a reasonable time prior to the commencement of trial. Accordingly, when a motion to proceed *pro se* is timely interposed, a trial court must permit a defendant to represent himself upon ascertaining that he has voluntarily and intelligently elected to do so, irrespective of how unwise such a choice might appear to be. Furthermore, the defendant's 'technical legal knowledge' is irrelevant to the court's assessment of the defendant's knowing exercise of the right to defend himself. [Citation.] However, once a defendant has chosen to proceed to trial represented by counsel, demands by such defendant that he be permitted to discharge his attorney and assume the defense himself shall be addressed to the sound discretion of the court. When such a midtrial request for self-representation is presented the trial court shall inquire *into* *sua sponte* into the specific factors underlying the request thereby ensuring a meaningful record in the event that appellate review is later required. Among other factors to be considered by the court in assessing such requests made after the commencement of trial are the quality of counsel's representation of the defendant, the defendant's prior proclivity to substitute counsel, the reasons for the request, the length and stage of the proceedings, and the disruption or

n't feel there is any change
tion representing himself. He
thains.

position to be attempting to
in the condition he is in, and I
e shackles during the balance

done many things that he
trial. He has seemed to, as I
path of his attorneys. He has
osterous as far as trial tactics
ctics, it would have been even,
dy disastrous from his stand-

senting himself in this final
ion of the trial which is going
mprisonment or whether he is
real travesty if I were to do

21 [137 Cal.Rptr. 8, 560 P.2d
constitutionally mandated un-
ndant in a criminal trial should
within a reasonable time prior
when a motion to proceed *pro*
rmit a defendant to represent
rily and intelligently elected to
e might appear to be. Further-
dge' is irrelevant to the court's
ise of the right to defend him-
has chosen to proceed to trial
fendant that he be permitted to
e himself shall be addressed to
ch a midtrial request for self-
all inquire *sua sponte* into the
y ensuring a meaningful record
quired. Among other factors to
requests made after the com-
l's representation of the defend-
ate counsel, the reasons for
eedings, and the disruption or

delay which might reasonably be expected to follow the granting of such a motion. Having established a record based on such relevant considerations, the court should then exercise its discretion and rule on the defendant's request." (*Id.* at pp. 127-129, fns. omitted.)

We are of the opinion that the court's denial of the motion in question was not error. (3a) Because defendant's request was filed in the midst of the jury's guilt phase deliberations, it was not timely for purposes of invoking an absolute right of self-representation under *Faretta* v. *California*, *supra*, 422 U.S. 806. (*Hamilton I*, *supra*, 41 Cal.3d at p. 421 [motion made after jury selection but before opening statements held untimely].) Accordingly, it was within the court's discretion to grant the request or not. (4) On review we cannot conclude that the court abused its discretion in denying the motion: having considered the *Windham* factors, the court made the reasonable determination that defendant should not be permitted to represent himself at the penalty phase. The fact that the court considered such irrelevant factors as defendant's inability "to roam around the courtroom" in shackles and his lack of competence in law does not undermine the soundness of its determination.

(3b) Defendant claims that his *Faretta* motion was indeed timely and hence effectively invoked an unconditional right of self-representation. He argues that the penalty phase of a capital trial amounts in actuality to a separate trial, and that he made his motion within a reasonable time prior to the commencement of that phase. We must reject the point because its predicate is unsound.

First, as even defendant acknowledges, the penalty phase has no separate formal existence but is merely a stage in a unitary capital trial. Second and more important, the connection between the phases of a capital trial is substantial and not merely formal. For example, Penal Code section 190.4, subdivision (c), provides that as a general matter "If the trier of fact which convicted the defendant of a crime for which he may be subject to the death penalty was a jury, the same jury shall consider any plea of not guilty by reason of insanity pursuant to [Penal Code] Section 1026, the truth of any special circumstances which may be alleged, and the penalty to be applied . . . ." Subdivision (d) of that same section declares that "In any case in which the defendant may be subject to the death penalty, evidence presented at any prior phase of the trial, including any proceeding under a plea of not guilty by reason of insanity pursuant to Section 1026 shall be considered at any subsequent phase of the trial, if the trier of fact of the prior phase is the same trier of fact at the subsequent phase."

Thus, we conclude that defendant was not denied a constitutional right of self-representation.

b. *Constitutionality of the Sentencing Formula of Penal Code Section 190.3*

(5) Defendant contends that the sentencing formula of Penal Code section 190.3 (hereafter section 190.3) is unconstitutional on the ground that it withdraws from the trier of fact constitutionally compelled discretion and thereby undermines the reliability of the verdict. Section 190.3, subdivision (k) states in relevant part that "the trier of fact shall consider, take into account and be guided by the aggravating and mitigating circumstances referred to in this section, and shall impose a sentence of death if the trier of fact concludes that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances." The point defendant makes here, however, was rejected in *People* v. *Brown* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 512, 538-544 [220 Cal.Rptr. 637, 709 P.2d 440], reversed on other grounds *sub nomine California* v. *Brown* (1987) 479 U.S. 538 [93 L.Ed.2d 934, 107 S.Ct. 837].

c. *Brown Error*

(6) Defendant may be understood to contend that former CALJIC No. 8.84.2, incorporating the mandatory sentencing language of section 190.3, may have misled the jurors to his prejudice as to the scope of their sentencing responsibility and discretion in violation of the constitutional principles set forth in *People* v. *Brown*, *supra*, 40 Cal.3d at pages 538-544.

In *Brown* we held that section 190.3, as construed therein, was not unconstitutional. (40 Cal.3d at pp. 538-544.) In conformity with settled constitutional principles, we interpreted the statutory language to require jurors to make " 'an individualized determination on the basis of the character of the individual and the circumstances of the crime' " (id. at p. 540, italics deleted) and a " ' . . . moral assessment of [the] facts . . . ' " (*Ibid.*)—and thereby decide "which penalty is appropriate in the particular case" (*id.* at p. 541).

Although in *Brown* we upheld the constitutionality of section 190.3, we nevertheless recognized that when delivered in an instruction the provision's mandatory sentencing language might mislead jurors as to the scope of their sentencing discretion and responsibility. (40 Cal.3d at p. 544, fn. 17.) Specifically, we believed that a juror might reasonably understand that language to define the penalty determination as "simply a finding of facts" (*id.* at p. 540) or "a mere mechanical counting of factors on each side of an imaginary 'scale' " (*id.* at p. 541). We also believed that a juror might reasonably understand the language to require him to vote for death if he finds that the evidence in aggravation outweighs the evidence in mitigation—even if he determines that death is not the appropriate penalty under all the

ia of Penal Code

rmula of Penal Code sec-
onal on the ground that it
compelled discretion and
Section 190.3, subdivision
shall consider, take into
mitigating circumstances
nce of death if the trier of
s outweigh the mitigating
however, was rejected in
0 Cal.Rptr. 637, 709 P.2d
rmia v. *Brown* (1987) 479

that former CALJIC No.
nguage of section 190.3,
he scope of their sentenc-
constitutional principles
ee pages 538-544.

d therein, was not uncon-
ity with settled constitu-
guage to require jurors to
the basis of the character
nce' " (id. at p. 540, italics
-] facts . . . ' " (*ibid.*)—
n the particular case" (*id.*

lity of section 190.3, we
on instruction the provi-
ed jurors as to the scope
(40 Cal.3d at p. 544, fn.
sonably understand that
simply a finding of facts"
factors on each side of an
d that a juror might re-
vote for death if he finds
ence in mitigation—even
he penalty under all the

circumstances. (See *id.* at pp. 540-544.) For this reason we directed trial courts thereafter to instruct jurors in conformity with the principles set forth therein, rather than in the bare words of the statute. (*Ibid.*) With respect to cases—such as the present—in which the jurors had been instructed in the statutory language, we announced that we would examine each such appeal on its merits to determine whether the jurors may have been misled to the defendant's prejudice. (*Ibid.*)

We turn now to the case at bar. After reviewing the record of the penalty phase in its entirety, we cannot conclude that the jurors may have been misled to defendant's prejudice by former CALJIC No. 8.84.2. Indeed, we believe that they were adequately informed as to what they were to do, and how they were to proceed, in the determination of penalty, and that neither concern expressed in *Brown* was substantially implicated. In support we make the following observations. First, although in closing argument the prosecutor referred briefly to the mandatory sentencing language, he clearly acknowledged that the jurors were "called upon to make the tremendous decision, tough decision," and were given discretion by the law to that end. Second, in his closing argument defense counsel emphasized that it was the responsibility of the jurors, and the jurors alone, to determine whether the death penalty was appropriate for defendant. Third, at defendant's request the court instructed the jurors as follows: "In weighing the aggravating and mitigating factors, you are not to merely count numbers on either side. You are instructed rather to weigh and consider the factors on each side as a whole"; and, "In order to impose a death sentence, you must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the totality of the aggravating circumstances outweigh[s] the totality of the mitigating circumstances."

Thus, on this record we find no *Brown* error.

d. *Easley "Factor (k)" Error*

(7) Defendant may be understood to contend that the pre-*Easley* (*People v. Easley* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 858 [196 Cal.Rptr. 309, 671 P.2d 813]) CALJIC No. 8.84.1 (k) instruction (hereafter former factor (k)), which was given in this case, may have misled the jurors as to the scope of their sentencing responsibility and discretion to defendant's prejudice.

Pursuant to former CALJIC No. 8.84.1, the court instructed the jurors that in determining the penalty they should consider several specified circumstances and also "(k) Any other circumstance which extenuates the gravity of the crime even though it is not a legal excuse for the crime."

In *People v. Easley*, *supra*, 34 Cal.3d 858, we concluded that the language of former factor (k) might mislead the jurors about the scope of their

discretion and responsibility under the federal Constitution as construed in *Lockett v. Ohio* (1978) 438 U.S. 586, 604 [57 L.Ed.2d 973, 989-990, 98 S.Ct. 2954], and *Eddings v. Oklahoma* (1982) 455 U.S. 104, 110 [71 L.Ed.2d 1, 8, 102 S.Ct. 869], in which the United States Supreme Court held that a sentencer may " 'not be precluded from considering *as a mitigating factor*, any aspect of the defendant's character or record . . . that the defendant proffers as a basis for a sentence less than death.' " (Italics in original.)

Because of the potentially misleading language of the instruction, we directed trial courts thereafter to inform the jury that they may consider in mitigation not only factor (k) but also "any other 'aspect of [the] defendant's character or record . . . that the defendant proffers as a basis for a sentence less than death.' " (34 Cal.3d at p. 878, fn. 10.)

In *People v. Brown*, *supra*, 40 Cal.3d 512, we announced that with respect to cases—such as the present—in which the jury had been instructed pursuant to the former factor (k), we would examine each such appeal on its merits to determine whether the jury may have been misled to the defendant's prejudice. (*Id.* at p. 544, fn. 17.) In conducting such an examination, we look to " 'the totality of the penalty instructions given and the arguments made to the jury' . . . ." (*People v. Rodrigues* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 730, 786 [230 Cal.Rptr. 667, 726 P.2d 113].)

We turn now to the case at bar. After reviewing the record of the penalty phase in its entirety, we cannot conclude that the jurors may have been misled to defendant's prejudice by the former factor (k) instruction. Indeed, we are of the opinion that the jurors were in fact adequately informed that they could consider character and background evidence. After the defense presented a case that consisted entirely of such evidence, the court instructed the jurors as follows: "The mitigating circumstances which I have read for your consideration are given to you merely as examples of some of the factors that you may take into account as reasons for deciding not to impose a death sentence upon Mr. Hamilton. You should not limit your consideration of mitigating circumstances to these specific factors. You may also consider any other circumstances presented as reasons for not imposing the death sentence."

Thus, on this record we find no *Easley* "factor (k)" error.

e. *Ramos Error*

(8) Defendant contends that the court committed reversible error under *People v. Ramos* (1984) 37 Cal.3d 136 [207 Cal.Rptr. 800, 689 P.2d 430]. In accordance with the so-called Briggs Instruction (former CALJIC No.

al Constitution as construed in
L.Ed.2d 973, 989-990, 98 S.Ct.
U.S. 104, 110 [71 L.Ed.2d 1, 8,
: Supreme Court held that a
sidering *as a mitigating factor,*
ecord . . . that the defendant
death.'" (Italics in original.)

nguage of the instruction, we
jury that they may consider in
other 'aspect of [the] defend-
ndant proffers as a basis for a
p. 878, fn. 10.)

e announced that with respect
ury had been instructed pursu-
mine each such appeal on its
ve been misled to the defend-
ducting such an examination,
tructions given and the argu-
drigues (1986) 42 Cal.3d 730,

wing the record of the penalty
at the jurors may have been
factor (k) instruction. Indeed,
fact adequately informed that
d evidence. After the defense
n evidence, the court instruct-
umstances which I have read
ly as examples of some of the
ons for deciding not to impose
ould not limit your consider-
ecific factors. You may also
reasons for not imposing the

"factor (k)" error.

umitted reversible error under
J.Rptr. 800, 689 P.2d 430]. In
action (former CALJIC No.

8.84.2 (1979)) the court delivered the following charge: "You are instructed that under the state Constitution, a governor is empowered to grant a reprieve, pardon or commutation after sentence following conviction of a crime. Under this power a governor may in the future commute or modify a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole to a lesser sentence that would include the possibility of parole."

In *People* v. *Ramos, supra*, 37 Cal.3d at page 153, we held that "the Briggs Instruction is incompatible with [the] guarantee of 'fundamental fairness' [established in the due process clauses of our Constitution (Cal. Const., art. I, §§ 7, 15)] both because it is seriously and prejudicially misleading and because it invites the jury to be influenced by speculative and improper considerations."

As to the misleading character of the instruction, we stated as follows. "Under the California Constitution, the Governor's power of commutation or pardon extends equally to a sentence of death and to a sentence of life without possibility of parole. [Citation.] The Briggs Instruction, however, informs the jury only that a sentence of life without possibility of parole may be commuted. Although the instruction is literally accurate as far as it goes, it is a classic example of a misleading 'half-truth.' Since the instruction is only given in a penalty trial—when the jury's attention is narrowly focused on two alternative punishments—the instruction would reasonably be understood by the average juror to mean, by negative implication, that while a sentence of life without possibility of parole may be commuted, a sentence of death may not. Viewed realistically and in context, the instruction provides the jury with seriously misleading information." (37 Cal.3d at p. 153, fn. omitted.)

Further, we explained that "there are a variety of reasons why . . . consideration [of the commutation power] is improper. The first and perhaps most obvious problem is the speculative nature of the inquiry that the instruction invites. . . . [¶] . . . Here, the jury must attempt to determine not only what a particular defendant will be like in the future but also what some presently unknown person—a future Governor—will do in response to the defendant's then condition. . . . [¶] Furthermore, . . . any instruction which draws the jury's attention to the possibility of future actions by a governor or parole board is likely to affect the jury's decisionmaking process in either of two illegitimate—though very different—ways, diverting the jury from its proper function. [¶] The first vice of such an instruction . . . is that it may tend to diminish the jury's sense of responsibility for its action." (*Id.* at pp. 156-157.) "Second, . . . an instruction on the possibility of commutation invites the jury to go beyond its proper role and attempt to 'preempt' the Governor's constitutional authority by imposing a sentence

that will at least minimize the opportunity for such a commutation." (*Id.* at p. 158.)

Under *Ramos*, we conclude that the court erred by charging the jury in accordance with the Briggs Instruction: the language of the instruction is misleading and invites speculation on irrelevant and improper matters.

The Attorney General argues in substance that a supplementary charge, delivered by the court immediately after the Briggs Instruction, made that instruction nonerroneous or in any event nonprejudicial. As relevant here, the court's full instructions were as follows.

"It is now your duty to determine which of the two penalties, death or confinement in the state prison for life without possibility of parole, shall be imposed on Mr. Hamilton.

"You are instructed that under the state Constitution, a governor is empowered to grant a reprieve, pardon or commutation after sentence following conviction of a crime. Under this power a governor may in the future commute or modify a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole to a lesser sentence that would include the possibility of parole. This is subject to the requirement that, in the case of any person twice convicted of a felony, a commutation or modification may not be granted absent the written recommendation of at least four justices of the California Supreme Court. Further, a life sentence requires a minimum incarceration of 25 years less one third off for good time credits before parole may be considered by the proper authorities.

"You are now instructed, however, that the matter of a possible commutation or modification of sentence is not to be considered by you in determining the punishment for Mr. Hamilton. You must not speculate as to whether such commutation or modification would ever occur. It is not your function to decide now whether this man will be suitable for parole at some future date. So far as you are concerned, you are to decide only whether this man shall suffer the death penalty or whether he shall be permitted to remain alive. If upon consideration of the evidence you believe that life imprisonment without possibility of parole is the proper sentence, you must assume that the governor, the Supreme Court, and those officials charged with the operation of our parole system will perform their duty in a correct and responsible manner, and that Mr. Hamilton will not be paroled unless he can be safely released into society. It would be a violation of your duty as jurors if you were to fix the penalty at death because of a doubt that the governor and other officials will properly carry out their responsibilities."

for such a commutation." (*Id.* at

rt erred by charging the jury in
e language of the instruction is
elevant and improper matters.

se that a supplementary charge,
e Briggs Instruction, made that
onprejudicial. As relevant here,
ws.

a of the two penalties, death or
out possibility of parole, shall be

ite Constitution, a governor is
commutation after sentence fol-
power a governor may in the
imprisonment without possibil-
include the possibility of parole.
the case of any person twice
odification may not be granted
st four justices of the California
quires a minimum incarceration
e credits before parole may be

he matter of a possible commu-
be considered by you in deter-
You must not speculate as to
would ever occur. It is not your
ll be suitable for parole at some
are to decide only whether this
ether he shall be permitted to
evidence you believe that life
s the proper sentence, you must
urt, and those officials charged
perform their duty in a correct
ilton will not be paroled unless
ld be a violation of your duty as
th because of a doubt that the
arry out their responsibilities."

Having considered the matter closely, we cannot agree that the supplementary charge somehow rendered the Briggs Instruction free of error: that charge does not alter the objectionable language, which continues to mislead and to invite speculation on irrelevant and improper matters.

We do agree, however, that on this record the error was nonprejudicial. As stated above, the court instructed the jurors "*not* to consider[ ]" "the matter of a possible commutation or modification of sentence . . . in determining the punishment for Mr. Hamilton," "*not* [to] speculate as to whether such commutation or modification would ever occur," and "*not* . . . to decide now whether this man will be suitable for parole at some future date." Defendant argues that the supplementary charge did not cure the harm of the Briggs Instruction, but rather led the jurors to indulge in irrelevant and improper speculation. The clear meaning of the plain words of the admonition, however, refutes this argument.

The court also delivered the following charge. "I have previously read to you the list of aggravating circumstances which the law permits you to consider if you find that any of them is established by the evidence. These are the only aggravating circumstances that you may consider. You are not allowed to take account of any other facts or circumstances as the basis for deciding that the death penalty would be an appropriate punishment in this case."

Through these instructions, the court directed the jurors not to make any use of the Briggs Instruction in determining the penalty to be imposed on defendant. Jurors are, of course, presumed to follow the instructions given by the court. (E.g., *Delli Paoli* v. *United States* (1957) 352 U.S. 232, 242 [1 L.Ed.2d 278, 285-286, 77 S.Ct. 294].) In this case we find no reason to believe that the jurors failed to discharge their duty.

Defendant argues in substance that the prosecutor exploited the Briggs Instruction in closing argument and thereby made the harm threatened by the instruction incurable. The comment complained of is as follows: "Now, [defense counsel will] say, 'If you give him life in prison, he will have to spend the rest of his days thinking about his crimes and thinking about the victims.' No way. . . . This defendant wouldn't spend all his time in prison thinking about his horrible crime. He's be conniving and devising ways to manipulate the system and get out. Look at his letters [to Officer Birse, Ruth Story and the San Diego District Attorney's office] now, how he operates."

We do not believe that the prosecutor intended this comment to refer to the Briggs Instruction. Had he desired to anticipate that charge, he would

evidently have touched on the Governor's commutation power expressly or at least by clear implication. But as the words of the remark show, he did not do so. More important, we do not believe that the jury would have understood the comment to refer to the instruction: the remark does not even allude to the commutation power. In any event, the comment was brief and isolated. As such, it could not make the error in this case incurable.

Hence, we conclude that on the facts of this case the giving of the Briggs Instruction did not amount to reversible error.

f. Consideration of Invalid Felony-murder-burglary Special Circumstances

(9) Defendant contends that the felony-murder-burglary special-circumstance finding was invalid (see *ante*, fn. 7) and, as such, was improperly presented to the jurors as evidence in aggravation under the instruction directing them to consider "the existence of any special circumstance found to be true." He then contends that the error requires reversal. We cannot agree. Assuming for argument's sake that the finding was invalid, we are nevertheless of the opinion that even if the jurors had not been instructed to consider the existence of this finding, they still would have returned a verdict of death: whereas the evidence in aggravation—even without the finding—was overwhelming, the evidence in mitigation was minimal.

g. Failure to Exercise Discretion to Strike the Special Circumstance Findings

Defendant contends in substance that at the automatic penalty-modification hearing conducted pursuant to Penal Code section 190.4, subdivision (e), the court had the authority, under Penal Code section 1385 (hereafter section 1385), to strike the special circumstance findings "in furtherance of justice" in order that he might be eligible for parole. He further contends that the court failed to consider whether it should exercise that authority.

(10) We agree that under the 1978 death penalty law the court had the authority to strike the special circumstance findings pursuant to section 1385. Indeed, we so held in *People* v. *Williams* (1981) 30 Cal.3d 470 [179 Cal.Rptr. 443, 637 P.2d 1029].

We cannot agree, however, that the court failed to consider whether it should exercise this authority. On our reading of the record, the court appears to have impliedly determined that there was no basis for striking the special circumstance findings. As the court expressly found, "the evi-

ation power expresly or
the remark show, he did
sat the jury would have
on: the remark does not
t, the comment was brief
r in this case incurable.

the giving of the Briggs

tlary Special

er-burglary special-cir-
as such, was improperly
under the instruction
cial circumstance found
es reversal. We cannot
ng was invalid, we are
l not been instructed to
ould have returned a
ion—even without the
ation was minimal.

Special Circumstance

utomatic penalty-mo-
section 190.4, subdivi-
de section 1385 (here-
e findings "in further-
or parole. He further
t should exercise that

law the court had the
s pursuant to section
l) 30 Cal.3d 470 [179

o consider whether it
he record, the court
no basis for striking
ssaly found, "the evi-

dence in aggravation is overwhelming and the evidence in mitigation is virtually nonexistent."

Defendant argues in substance that the court may nevertheless have entertained the erroneous belief that it was without authority to strike the special circumstance findings, and that it should be directed to determine whether or not there was a basis to strike those findings. We are not persuaded. The record contains no evidence suggesting that the court believed it was without such authority. In the absence of such evidence, we are unwilling to assume that the court may have entertained an erroneous belief as to the scope of its powers. We presume the court was aware of the general rule that section 1385 authorizes the court to dismiss "in furtherance of justice" in any circumstance in which the legislative body has not clearly manifested a contrary intent. (*People* v. *Superior Court* (*Howard*) (1968) 69 Cal.2d 491, 503-505 [72 Cal.Rptr. 330, 446 P.2d 138] [dismissing entire action].) We also presume the court read the death penalty law, as we subsequently did in *People* v. *Williams, supra*, 30 Cal.3d at pages 484-485, as not intended to limit the court's authority in the circumstances relevant here. Accordingly, we cannot conclude that the court erroneously believed it was without authority to strike the special circumstance findings under section 1385.

(11) Finally, we are of the opinion that in view of the theories presented and the evidence introduced, the jury's guilt phase verdicts imply a finding that defendant was the actual killer (*Enmund* v. *Florida* (1982) 458 U.S. 782, 788-801 [73 L.Ed.2d 1140, 1145-1154, 102 S.Ct. 3368]). Having reviewed the record in its entirety, we conclude that this finding is amply supported by the evidence and adopt it as our own. Accordingly, we hold that the imposition of the penalty of death on defendant does not violate the Eighth Amendment. (*Cabana* v. *Bullock* (1986) 474 U.S. 376, 386 [88 L.Ed.2d 704, 716, 106 S.Ct. 689, 697].)[*]

II. HABEAS CORPUS (CRIM. 25303)

In his petition for a writ of habeas corpus in Crim. 25303, defendant bases his claim to relief on three grounds. He first asserts he was not provided with effective assistance by trial and appellate counsel. (12) To establish such a point, a defendant must show that counsel (1) performed at a level below an objective standard of reasonableness under prevailing professional norms; and thereby (2) subjected the defense to prejudice, i.e., in

[*]After oral argument defendant submitted a number of motions in propria persona asking that appointed appellate counsel be relieved and other specified counsel be substituted in his place. Because each of these attorneys has declined to state he is available or has declared he is unavailable, we deny the motions.

the absence of counsel's failings a more favorable outcome was reasonably probable. (*People* v. *Ledesma* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 171, 216-218 [233 Cal.Rptr. 404, 729 P.2d 839].) As we shall explain, defendant fails to make a prima facie case of entitlement to relief.

(13) Defendant alleges broadly that trial counsel made various errors in strategy and tactics and, more specifically, that they feared him and treated him with distrust. Such assertions do not effectively allege either deficient performance or prejudice.

He also alleges appellate counsel refused to argue that facial expressions and gestures trial counsel assertedly made during jury selection prejudiced the defense. This statement too fails to effectively allege either deficient performance or prejudice.

Defendant next claims that he was denied due process because the trial judge was biased. In support of his point, he cites the following incidents: (1) in an in camera hearing the judge stated he believed trial counsel and did not believe defendant in a dispute as to whether counsel had threatened him with harm; and (2) in another in camera conference, the judge told him, "You have proven yourself an unmitigated liar during the course of this whole trial." (14) But the fact that the judge made these statements—each of which is more than adequately supported by the evidence—does not amount to a prima facie showing of bias: "'[W]hen the state of mind of the trial judge appears to be adverse to one of the parties but is based upon actual observance of the witnesses and evidence given during the trial of an action, it does not amount to . . . prejudice . . . .'" (*People* v. *Yeager* (1961) 55 Cal.2d 374, 391 [10 Cal.Rptr. 829, 359 P.2d 261].)

Defendant's final "claim" is in substance as follows: he states that at the new trial that might have followed our decision in *Hamilton I* the court would again deny his request to represent himself. Whether or not the court would so rule in the future raises no issue cognizable on habeas corpus. In any event, because we affirm the judgment in its entirety there will be no such new trial.

III. HABEAS CORPUS (8001870)

In his petition for a writ of habeas corpus in 8001870, defendant bases his claim to relief on what are in substance four grounds. He first asserts he was not provided with effective assistance by trial and appellate counsel. As will appear, he fails to make a prima facie case.

To begin with, we seriously doubt defendant has adequately alleged deficient performance on the part of counsel. His first complaint is that

...ble outcome was reasonably
171, 216-218 [233 Cal.Rptr.
...dant fails to make a prima

...unsel made various errors in
they feared him and treated
...tively allege either deficient

...argue that facial expressions
...ng jury selection prejudiced
...tively allege either deficient

...ue process because the trial
...ites the following incidents:
...elieved trial counsel and did
counsel had threatened him
...ference, the judge told him,
...r during the course of this
...ge made these statements—
...d by the evidence—does not
...hen the state of mind of the
...e parties but is based upon
...n given during the trial of an
...'" (*People* v. *Yeager*
..., 359 P.2d 261].)

...follows: he states that at the
...ion in *Hamilton I* the court
...elf. Whether or not the court
...inable on habeas corpus. In
its entirety there will be no

...S001870)

...S001870, defendant bases his
...ounds. He first asserts he was
...nd appellate counsel. As will

...dant has adequately alleged
...l. His first complaint is that

counsel failed to communicate with him or to allow him to participate in the development of strategy and tactics. The charge, however, is conclusory and without specificity. The second complaint is that counsel failed to fully investigate the facts of the case. This charge runs in substance as follows: Buchanan, as is undisputed, left class on the night of May 30, 1979, before an optional quiz was given; a copy of that quiz was subsequently found in the van; that copy—defendant conjectures—*must* have been brought to the van by one of Buchanan's classmates; that classmate—defendant declares—*may* have been the killer; counsel knew that Buchanan had left class before the quiz was given, and knew that a copy of the quiz was found in the van; therefore, counsel should have sought evidence about the classmate. We doubt, however, that counsel's performance can be called deficient. There was simply nothing more than the merest speculation that an unknown classmate may have gone to the van and may have killed Buchanan. Without something more, it is difficult to conclude that counsel was obligated to investigate further.

In any event, we are of the opinion that defendant has not adequately alleged prejudice. Indeed, he has wholly failed to show that absent counsel's alleged failings a more favorable outcome in the guilt phase was reasonably probable on the facts of this case.

Defendant next claims that the prosecution introduced "False evidence . . . substantially material or probative on the issue of guilt" (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (b)(1)). His complaint is in essence as follows: the optional quiz *must* have been brought into the van by one of Buchanan's classmates; the prosecution was aware of this fact, but presented its case as though Buchanan brought the quiz to the van herself. The premise is unsound: the record establishes that after class Buchanan spoke with friends who had taken the quiz, probably obtained a copy from one of them, and therefore may have brought it to the van herself. Hence, defendant fails to make a prima facie case.

(15) Defendant also claims that he had a right to be present at a pretrial hearing conducted on July 6, 1981. At that hearing, the court in essence established a schedule under which a defense criminologist could examine the van, which was then in storage in Oklahoma, before it was driven back to California by agents of the prosecution. Again, as will appear, no prima facie case is made.

It is the rule that "the accused is not entitled to be personally present . . . [on] matters in which defendant's presence does not bear a '"reasonably substantial relation to the fullness of his opportunity to defend against the charge."'" (*People* v. *Jackson* (1980) 28 Cal.3d 264, 309 [168 Cal.Rptr.

603, 618 P.2d 149], citing cases (plur. opn.).) Under this rule, defendant did not have a right to be present at the hearing: his attendance at what was essentially a scheduling hearing would not have been useful or of benefit to the defense.

(16) Defendant's final claim is that the prosecution interfered with his attempt to obtain evidence. Specifically, he charges that the prosecution had the van examined and cleaned before the defense criminologist could subject it to inspection and tests. It is of course the rule that "in no event can duly constituted authority hamper or interfere with efforts on the part of an accused to obtain [evidence] . . . , without denying him due process of law." (*In re Martin* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 509, 512 [24 Cal.Rptr. 833, 374 P.2d 801] [blood sample to determine intoxication].) The petition, however, fails to adequately allege interference: it states that the prosecution had the van examined and cleaned before the defense criminologist could begin his work; it does not state that the criminologist acted without undue delay or that the delay on his part was attributable to the prosecution.

The judgment is affirmed. The petition for writ of habeas corpus in Crim. 25303 is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus in S001870 is denied.

Lucas, C. J., Panelli, J., Arguelles, J., Eagleson, J., and Kaufman, J., concurred.

BROUSSARD, J.—Concurring and dissenting.—I concur in the affirmance of the findings of guilt and special circumstances and in the denials of the petitions for writ of habeas corpus. I dissent from the affirmance of the death penalty.

The majority properly conclude that the trial court erred in giving an instruction in accordance with the so-called Briggs Instruction (former CALJIC No. 8.84.2 (1979)) on the Governor's power to commute a sentence of life without possibility of parole. (*People* v. *Ramos* (1984) 37 Cal.3d 136, 153 [207 Cal.Rptr. 800, 689 P.2d 430].) As the majority recognize, the language of the instruction is misleading and invites speculation on irrelevant matters. However, the majority also conclude that subsequent instructions telling the jury to disregard the Governor's power to commute eliminated any prejudice. I do not agree.

In my view the error was prejudicial. I cannot agree that the later instructions unrung the bell. Far from unringing the bell, the subsequent instructions could only have the effect of reminding the jury again and again of the Governor's commutation power. Furthermore the prosecutor exploited the error in closing argument. To conclude that, when the cacophony was

) Under this rule, defendant did
ıg: his attendance at what was
ıave been useful or of benefit to

prosecution interfered with his
ıarges that the prosecution had
ıse criminologist could subject
rule that "in no event can duly
with efforts on the part of an
t denying him due process of
12 [24 Cal.Rptr. 833, 374 P.2d
].) The petition, however, fails
ıt the prosecution had the van
criminologist could begin his
acted without undue delay or
: to the prosecution.

writ of habeas corpus in Crim.
ıs corpus in S001870 is denied.

ıgleson, J., and Kaufman, J.,

senting—I concur in the
ial circumstances and in the
corpus. I dissent from the

trial court erred in giving an
f Briggs Instruction (former
r's power to commute a sen-
ple v. *Ramos* (1984) 37 Cal.3d
As the majority recognize, the
invites speculation on irrele-
clude that subsequent instruc-
or's power to commute elimi-

ot agree that the later instruc-
bell, the subsequent instruc-
he jury again and again of the
: the prosecutor exploited the
t, when the cacophony was

complete and overwhelming, there was no prejudice is to turn a deaf ear to fairness and justice.

The Briggs Instruction has been uniformly held to be prejudicial error in a penalty trial because it is so misleading as to constitute a denial of due process, improperly tilting the jury in favor of the death penalty. (*People* v. *Anderson* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1104, 1150-1151 [240 Cal.Rptr. 585, 742 P.2d 1306]; *People* v. *Myers* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 250, 272-273 [233 Cal.Rptr. 264, 729 P.2d 698]; *People* v. *Monteil* (1985) 39 Cal.3d 910, 928 [218 Cal.Rptr. 572, 705 P.2d 1248]; *People* v. *Haskett* (1982) 30 Cal.3d 841, 861-863 [180 Cal.Rptr. 640, 640 P.2d 776].) In *Anderson*, it is stated that the Briggs Instruction "necessarily subjects the defendant to prejudice." (43 Cal.3d at p. 1151.) As pointed out in *Myers*: "The Attorney General . . . has cited no instance, and we are aware of none, in which this type of instructional error has been found nonprejudicial in a death penalty case, and in view of the very serious potential for prejudice emphasized in *Ramos*, we strongly doubt whether we could ever confidently conclude that there was no reasonable possibility that this instruction improperly tainted the jury's decision-making process." (43 Cal.3d at p. 272.)

In *Myers*, the defendant introduced evidence of the past practices of California governors to show that it was extremely unlikely that he ever would be released if sentenced to life without possibility of parole. The court concluded that far from neutralizing the improper instruction "in reality the additional focus on commutation in this case had the inevitable and unfortunate effect of highlighting the ostensible importance of the commutation question." (43 Cal.3d at pp. 272-273.)

In this case the trial court's instruction to the jury that it was their duty to determine whether death or confinement in state prison without possibility of parole should be imposed on defendant was followed immediately by its instruction on the Governor's commutation power. The court thereby emphasized the importance of the instructions on the Governor's powers, suggesting that they are the first and most important step in the process of determining the penalty.[1]

[1] "It is now your duty to determine which of the two penalties, death or confinement in the state prison for life without possibility of parole, shall be imposed on Mr. Hamilton.

"You are instructed that under the state Constitution, a governor is empowered to grant a reprieve, pardon or commutation after sentence following conviction of a crime. Under this power a governor may in the future commute or modify a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole to a lesser sentence that would include the possibility of parole.

"This is subject to the requirement that, in the case of any person twice convicted of a felony, a commutation or modification may not be granted absent the written recommendation

The importance of the Governor's powers was further emphasized because of their length; the instructions went beyond those contemplated by Penal Code section 190.3, the Briggs Instruction.

The first instruction was not limited to the Governor's power to commute a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Rather it spoke of the Governor's powers generally. Subsequent instructions told the jury of the Governor's power to commute a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole to a sentence of life imprisonment with parole, a limitation on the power, and the effect of a commutation. The instructions did not stop with the instruction contemplated by Penal Code section 190.3 condemned in *Ramos* but repeatedly emphasized the Governor's power. The instructions thus were not the brief but invalid reference to the Governor's power contemplated by Penal Code section 190.3 but included in addition an instruction applicable to a death sentence and instructions detailing matters which could only serve to toll the bell repeatedly. While the majority concede that error occurred (maj. opn., p. 374), they do not recognize the full scope of the error.

The majority further take the position that subsequent instructions told the jury to disregard the prior instructions, that we must presume the jury followed the later instructions and that they eliminated the prejudice due to the erroneous instructions on the Governor's powers. (Maj. opn., *ante*, at p. 375.)

I doubt whether any instruction could eliminate the prejudice flowing from the improper and detailed emphasis placed on the Governor's commutation power. The power was given too much importance and emphasis to allow further instructions to eliminate the prejudice. Furthermore the subsequent instructions given in the instant case were in themselves erroneous, confusing and contradictory and, when all was said and done, probably left the jury with the view that it should consider the Governor's powers so long as it assumed that the powers would be properly exercised. Such instructions do not eliminate the prejudice flowing from the improper mention of the Governor's powers; they exacerbate the prejudice.[1]

of at least four justices of the California Supreme Court. Further, a life sentence requires a minimum incarceration of 25 years less one third off for good time credits before parole may be considered by the proper authorities."

[1] "You are now instructed, however, that the matter of a possible commutation or modification of sentence is not to be considered by you in determining the punishment for Mr. Hamilton. You must not speculate as to whether such commutation or modification would ever occur.

was further emphasized be-
yond those contemplated by
:tion.

overnor's power to commute
ibility of parole. Rather it
sequent instructions told the
ntence of life imprisonment
e imprisonment with parole,
nmutation. The instructions
by Penal Code section 190.3
ized the Governor's power.
alid reference to the Gover-
ction 190.3 but included in
ntence and instructions de-
e bell repeatedly. While the
., p. 374), they do not recog-

subsequent instructions told
t we must presume the jury
minated the prejudice due to
owers. (Maj. opn., *ante*, at p.

inate the prejudice flowing
on the Governor's commu-
importance and emphasis to
udice. Furthermore the sub-
re in themselves erroneous,
said and done, probably left
e Governor's powers so long
rly exercised. Such instruc-
on the improper mention of
prejudice.[3]

Further, a life sentence requires a
ood time credits before parole may

of a possible commutation or mo-
termining the punishment for Mr
ommutation or modification would

Like the evidence of past Governor practices in *People* v. *Myers, supra,* 43 Cal.3d 250, 272-273, the instructions relied upon by the majority in the instant case, far from neutralizing the improper instructions on the commutation power, served to emphasize the commutation question. The jury was initially told not to consider a possible commutation or to speculate whether there would be a commutation, and it was not its function to determine whether defendant would be suitable for parole at a later date. But telling the jury not to consider a possible commutation, to speculate, or to decide whether this man will be suitable for parole at some later date simply emphasizes the commutation question in the juror's mind.

Moreover, the jury was not told to ignore the Governor's power but was told that the Governor, the Supreme Court and the parole officials would properly perform their duties. In *Ramos,* after concluding that fundamental fairness precluded telling the jury of the commutation power, the court addressed the question whether the jury should be told *not* to consider the Governor's commutation power. While we recognized that in some circumstances not relevant here the jury might be told to disregard the power, we concluded that the jury should not be so instructed because the instruction "is simply more likely to bring the matter to the jury's attention and, as a practical matter, be difficult to follow." (37 Cal.3d at p. 159, fn. 12.) Accordingly, even if no commutation instruction had been given, it would have been error in the instant case to give the supplementary instructions because they called the jury's attention to the commutation issue. To conclude, as the majority do, that an instruction which is erroneous because it may call the jury's attention to a prejudicial matter somehow eliminates the prejudice in other instructions which call the jury's attention to the very same prejudicial matter involves a mental exercise incomprehensible to me.

But even if we accept the majority's thesis that somehow instructions which are error because of their prejudicial effect can somehow cure other instructions which are error because they have the same prejudicial effect, we still must look at the content of the subsequent instructions of the trial court.

"It is not your function to decide now whether this man will be suitable for parole at some future date. So far as you are concerned, you are to decide only whether this man shall suffer the death penalty or whether he shall be permitted to remain alive.

"If upon consideration of the evidence you believe that life imprisonment without possibility of parole is the proper sentence, you must assume that the Governor, the Supreme Court, and those officials charged with the operation of our parole system will perform their duty in a correct and responsible manner, and that Mr. Hamilton will not be paroled unless he can be safely released into society.

"It would be a violation of your duty as jurors if you were to fix the penalty at death because of a doubt that the Governor and other officials will properly carry out their responsibilities." (Italics added.)

Far from being told that it was improper to consider the possibilities of commutation and subsequent parole, the jury was told that it should consider those possibilities but only in the perspective that, when and if defendant was paroled, it would be done lawfully. The instructions to disregard and not to consider were literally contradicted and the jury was left with not only erroneous instructions but also contradictory and confusing instructions as to the importance of the Governor's commutation power.

What did this jury do when faced with confusing and conflicting instructions concerning the Governor's commutation power? All we can do is guess. I suspect that the jury may have concluded that it should not try to determine whether this defendant would have his sentence commuted and obtain a parole but that it must conclude that the commutation power was a factor militating against life imprisonment without possibility of parole and in favor of the death penalty and that it must assume that if defendant was paroled it would be done lawfully. To execute a defendant based on the Governor's power to commute sentences whether done lawfully or unlawfully violates the fundamental fairness guaranteed by the due process clause of our state Constitution.

The prosecutor exploited the fundamental unfairness of the instructions in his closing argument. The prosecutor suggested that if defendant received a sentence of life imprisonment he "wouldn't spend all his time in prison thinking about his horrible crimes. He'd be conniving and devising ways to *manipulate the system and get out.* . . . Look at his letters [to Officer Burse, Ruth Story and the San Diego District Attorney's office] now, how he operates." (Italics added.) The comment is a direct comment on the possibility that defendant would be paroled. The only way that he could "manipulate the system and get out" by appealing to governmental authorities was through exercise of the commutation power. The majority suggest that the prosecutor was only trying to state that defendant was lacking in feeling and self-centered (maj. opn., p. 374), but the comment speaks for itself.

In the instant case the instructions discussing the Governor's powers were as long as those setting forth and defining the aggravating and mitigating circumstances which should control the application of the death penalty. I am satisfied that the instructions on the Governor's powers were more harmful than any we have seen in prior cases. The supplemental instructions relied upon by the majority did not eliminate the prejudice but could only have emphasized the commutation power and confused the jury into

consider the possibilities of
is told that it should consid-
that, when and if defendant
structions to disregard and
the jury was left with not
tory and confusing instruc-
commutation power.

sing and conflicting instruc-
power? All we can do is
ded that it should not try to
his sentence commuted and
se commutation power was a
out possibility of parole and
assume that if defendant was
e a defendant based on the
her done lawfully or unlaw-
sed by the due process clause

unfairness of the instructions
ted that if defendant received
spend all his time in prison
nniving and devising ways to
at his letters [to Officer Birse,
orney's office] now, how he
direct comment on the possi-
ly way that he could "manip-
governmental authorities was
The majority suggest that the
ant was lacking in feeling and
omment speaks for itself.

ssing the Governor's powers
g the aggravating and mitigat-
pplication of the death penal-
Governor's powers were more
ts. The supplemental instruc-
minate the prejudice but could
er and confused the jury into

believing that the power was an important matter, if not the most important matter, to be considered by the jury in determining the penalty. The prosecutor referred to possible parole in his closing argument, and the prejudice from the errors is overwhelming.

2

APPENDIX 1-B

[Crim. No. 21958. Dec. 31, 1985.]

THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v.
BERNARD LEE HAMILTON, Defendant and Appellant.

SUMMARY

Following a jury trial, defendant was convicted of first degree murder, burglary, robbery, and kidnapping. Special circumstances allegations that the murder was committed while defendant was engaged in or was an accomplice in the commission of robbery, burglary, and kidnapping were found to be true. The jury fixed the punishment at death. (Superior Court of San Diego County, No. 47283, Franklin B. Orfield, Judge.)

The Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of guilt, but set aside the special circumstances findings and reversed the penalty judgment. The court held the trial court's failure to instruct the jury that in order to find true the special circumstances allegations, it must find an intent to kill, was reversible error. The only theory on which the jury was instructed vis-à-vis the murder was felony murder, which does not require a finding of intent to kill. The court held the evidence did not establish intent to kill as a matter of law, where the coroner was unable to determine the cause of death of the victim, or whether her head and hands were cut off before or after death, where the one stab wound that was inflicted before death was nonfatal, and where it was possible the victim might have been killed accidentally, with defendant deciding afterwards to mutilate her body in an attempt to prevent its identification. (Opinion by Kaus, J.,* with Broussard and Reynoso, JJ., concurring. Separate concurring opinions by Grodin, J., and by Bird, C. J. Separate concurring and dissenting opinions by Lucas, J., and by Mosk, J.)

HEADNOTES

Classified to California Digest of Official Reports, 3d Series

(1a-1f) **Criminal Law § 87—Rights of Accused—Aid of Counsel—Self-representation—Discretion of Trial Court.**—Unless a defendant's

*Retired Associate Justice of the Supreme Court sitting under assignment by the Chairperson of the Judicial Council.

motion to proceed in propria persona is made within a reasonable time before commencement of trial, it does not invoke the constitutionally mandated unconditional right of self-representation, but puts the matter within the court's discretion. In a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses, the trial court properly exercised its discretion in denying defendant's motion to proceed in propria persona, where the motion, which was made in the context of a hearing on motions to exclude evidence and set aside the indictment, was untimely, in that the hearing had begun two months earlier and had produced several days of testimony, and where the court noted defendant had not stated a valid reason for relieving counsel and was grasping at anything to delay the proceedings.

(2a-2f) **Criminal Law § 87—Rights of Accused—Aid of Counsel—Self-representation—Discretion of Trial Court.**—In exercising its discretion in determining whether to grant defendant's motion to proceed in propria persona, the trial court should consider the quality of counsel's representation of the defendant, the defendant's prior proclivity to substitute counsel, the reasons for the request, the length and stage of the proceedings, and the disruption or delay which might reasonably be expected to follow the granting of such a motion. Therefore, in a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's motion to proceed in propria persona, where the motion was made after the jury had already been selected and was therefore not timely for purposes of having an absolute right of self-representation, and where the court noted that it had already taken four weeks to select the jury, that the reason for defendant's request seemed groundless, that defendant was receiving high quality representation, and that he had a proclivity to substitute counsel.

(3a-3e) **Criminal Law § 44—Rights of Accused—Fair Trial—Physical Restraints on Defendant; Jail Clothing—Discretion of Trial Court.**—A trial court must make the decision to use physical restraints on a case-by-case basis, and its determination, when made pursuant to a hearing outside the jury's presence, with the court making a due process determination regarding the necessity for the restraints on record, cannot be successfully challenged on review except on a showing of a manifest abuse of discretion. Therefore, on appeal of a conviction of first degree murder and other offenses, defendant's contention that the trial court abused its discretion in ordering him to be shackled during the trial was without merit, where the trial court held an in camera hearing, heard testimony by law enforcement officers and

the defendant, and made an on-the-record determination of the necessity for ordering defendant shackled.

(4a-4f) **Criminal Law § 658—Appellate Review—Harmless and Reversible Error—Evidence—Prior Conviction or Misconduct—Proof of Motive and Identity.**—In a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses, the trial court erred in admitting three letters written by defendant approximately six years before the crimes in issue, while defendant was in prison for another crime. The letters, which were written to a superior court judge and the district attorney's office, expressed defendant's fear of prison and offered to provide information about crimes committed by others in exchange for release from prison. They were ruled admissible on the issue of motive and identity. However, the proffered motive of killing the victim, who allegedly witnessed defendant burglarizing her vehicle, based on defendant's extreme fear of prison, rested entirely on speculation and a tenuous chain of inferences. Nonetheless, it did not appear reasonably probable that the jury would have reached a more favorable result had the letters not been admitted, and therefore the error was not prejudicial, where, even without the letters the jury would have known of defendant's prior convictions of various crimes, and where there was strong circumstantial evidence of defendant's guilt.

(5a-5d) **Criminal Law § 311—Evidence of Other Crimes or Misconduct—Exceptions to Rule of Inadmissibility—To Prove Facts Material to People's Case.**—Evidence of a defendant's prior criminal acts is inadmissible under Evid. Code, § 1101, unless it is relevant to prove some fact, such as motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident, other than defendant's disposition to commit such acts. The factual relevance, however, must pertain to some issue that is actually in dispute, and even then the trial court must exercise its discretion under Evid. Code, § 352, and exclude the evidence if its relevancy to prove the disputed fact is not of sufficient probative value to outweigh the manifest prejudice of such evidence.

(6a-6e) **Criminal Law § 375—Admissions and Declarations—Ambiguity of Statement.**—In a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses, the trial court properly admitted in evidence a statement made by defendant to a deputy sheriff who was transporting defendant between jail and the courtroom. The deputy was tightening defendant's security chains, when defendant told the sheriff he could have his fun, and defendant would have his later. In response to the deputy's reply "I thought you already had your fun," defendant said: "Yeah, and I'll

ion of the neces-

less and Revers-
nduct—Proof of
gree murder and
se letters written
es in issue, while
ters, which were
rney's office, ex-
vide information
ease from prison.
d identity. How-
o allegedly wit-
defendant's ex-
d a tenuous chain
bly probable that
ad the letters not
cial, where, even
defendant's prior
rong circumstan-

mes or Miscon-
Prove Facts Ma-
rior criminal acts
relevant to prove
reparation, plan,
ident, other than
actual relevance,
y in dispute, and
nder Evid. Code,
rove the disputed
he manifest prej-

ions—Ambiguity
der and other of-
a statement made
ing defendant be-
ening defendant's
uld have his fun,
he deputy's reply
d: "Yeah, and I'll

kill a lot more too, and you may be first on my list." The trial court properly determined that there was no interrogation of defendant by the deputy and also properly rejected defendant's assertion that the statement was too ambiguous to constitute an admission. Although defendant did not mention any specific victims, he did admit to having killed someone, and the statement required no speculation to connect it to the issue of whether defendant had killed the victim.

(7a-7e) **Criminal Law § 392—Admissibility—Documentary Evidence—Letters Written by Defendant Containing Threats to Witnesses and Others.**—On appeal of a conviction of first degree murder, defendant's contention that the trial court erred in admitting in evidence a letter written by him, in which he discussed the offer of another individual to "take out" his defense attorney, the prosecutor, and others if he lost the case, was without merit. In light of defendant's knowledge that authorities would copy and read his letter, defendant's mention of death threats, despite his stated reluctance to agree to them, constituted an attempt to intimidate the persons at whom the threats were directed. Moreover, defendant's contention that the trial court should have excluded the letter as more prejudicial than probative under Evid. Code, § 352, even though he never raised the claim at trial, was without merit. Defendant presented no pertinent authority to support his assertion that the trial court had a sua sponte duty to consider exclusion under § 352.

(8a-8e) **Criminal Law § 400—Admissibility—Demonstrative Evidence—Weapons and Instruments of Crime—Evidence Indicating Consciousness of Guilt.**—In a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting in evidence a pruning type saw, a butcher knife, and two shanks of twine that defendant purchased after the murder of the victim. The trial court correctly determined that the probative value of the evidence was sufficient to warrant its admission, despite its potential prejudice. The evidence was relevant to show defendant's consciousness of guilt, in that the victim, whose ankles were bound, and whose wrists had been tied together, was decapitated and her hands cut off. These unusual factors also appeared to be closely related to the fact that defendant had threatened to kill his girlfriend to whom he had made incriminating statements, and who appeared to him to be a serious threat to his liberty as a witness.

(9a-9e) **Criminal Law § 55—Rights of Accused—Fair Trial—Confrontation by Witnesses—Unavailable Witness—Diligence in Locating Witness.**—In a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses,

any error by the trial court in admitting the preliminary hearing testimony of a prosecution witness who had been cooperative but who had unexpectedly disappeared two weeks before trial, was clearly harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. The witness' testimony concerned the fact that defendant, who was using one of the victim's credit cards, ran out of the store at which the witness was employed before approval for a purchase could be given. The witness notified the police, and defendant was eventually arrested. The trial court found the prosecution had exercised due diligence in attempting to secure attendance of the witness, even though it had never used the Uniform Act to Secure Attendance of Witnesses. Since the witness could not be located after his disappearance, it would have been pointless to have used the uniform act. Moreover, the witness' preliminary hearing testimony was peripheral and could not have affected the verdict.

(10a-10d) **Homicide § 110—Appeal—Harmless and Reversible Error—Instructions—Felony Murder—Special Circumstances—Necessity of Intent.**—In a prosecution for first degree murder and other offenses, the trial court committed reversible error in failing to instruct the jury that in order to find true the special circumstances that the murder was commined while defendant was engaged in or was an accomplice in the commission of robbery, burglary, and kidnapping, it must find an intent to kill. The only theory on which the jury was instructed vis-à-vis the murder was felony murder, which does not require a finding of intent to kill, and the evidence did not establish intent to kill as a matter of law, where the coroner was unable to determine the cause of death or whether the victim's head and hands were cut off before or after death, where the one stab wound that was inflicted before death was nonfatal, and where it was possible that the victim might have been killed accidentally, with defendant deciding afterwards to mutilate the body in an attempt to prevent its identification.

[See **Cal.Jur.3d (Rev)**, Criminal Law, § 3343; **Am.Jur.2d**, Homicide, § 499.]

(11a-11c) **Homicide § 110—Appeal—Harmless and Reversible Error—Instructions—Failure to Instruct on Necessity for Intent to Kill in Felony-murder Special Circumstances.**—In a capital case involving felony-murder special circumstances, the trial court's error in instructing the jury so as to entirely remove the issue of intent from its consideration is reversible per se, unless the erroneous instruction was given in connection with an offense for which the defendant was acquitted, unless the defendant conceded the issue of intent, unless the factual question posed by the instruction was necessarily resolved ad-

y hearing testi-
ve but who had
learly harmless
ncerned the fact
t cards, ran out
approval for a
, and defendant
ecution had ex-
of the witness,
ure Attendance
after his disap-
he uniform act.
was peripheral

rsible Error—
ces—Necessity
l other offenses,
nstruct the jury
the murder was
a accomplice in
it must find an
nstructed vis-à-
ire a finding of
kill as a matter
cause of death
before or after
efore death was
ight have been
to mutilate the

m.Jur.2d, Ho-

ersible Error—
ntent to Kill in
l case involving
rror in instruct-
nt from its con-
instruction was
fendant was ac-
ntent, unless the
ily resolved ad-

versely to the defendant under other, properly given instructions, or unless the evidence establishes intent to kill as a matter of law and shows no evidence to the contrary that is worthy of consideration.

COUNSEL

Barry L. Morris, under appointment by the Supreme Court, for Defendant and Appellant.

John K. Van de Kamp, Attorney General, Jay M. Bloom, John W. Carney and Pat Zaharopoulos, Deputy Attorneys General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

OPINION

KAUS, J.*—Defendant Bernard Lee Hamilton was convicted of first degree murder, burglary, robbery and kidnapping (Pen. Code, §§ 187, 459, 211, 207).[1] Special circumstance allegations that the murder was committed while defendant was engaged in or was an accomplice in the commission of robbery (§ 190.2, subd. (a)(17)(i)), burglary (§ 190.2, subd. (a)(17)(vii)), and kidnapping (§ 190.2, subd. (a)(17)(ii))—all under the 1978 death penalty law—were found to be true. The jury fixed the punishment at death. The appeal is automatic. (Cal. Const., art. VI, § 11; § 1239, subd. (b).)

For reasons hereafter stated, we affirm the judgment of guilt, but set aside the special circumstance findings and reverse the penalty judgment.

I. FACTS

1. *Prosecution Case*

On May 31, 1979, about 1 p.m., the body of Eleanore Frances Buchanan was discovered in the grass near a cul-de-sac off Pine Valley Road, near San Diego. Harry Piper noticed it while walking back to his car from target shooting. The body had no head or hands and was clothed only in a bra, underpants and socks.

*Retired Associate Justice of the Supreme Court sitting under assignment by the Chairperson of the Judicial Council.

[1]Except as otherwise indicated, all statutory references are to the Penal Code.

The body appeared to be in full rigor mortis when a deputy sheriff arrived at the scene between 1:30 and 2 p.m. Two strings of white cord were tied around the ankles, and there were dark blue fibers sticking to some blood on the body. There were marks on the wrists indicating that they had been tied together. A search of the area revealed no clothing or anything else that could be associated with the victim.

Dr. Luibel, who performed the autopsy, was unable to determine the cause of death because of the absence of the head. (The head and hands have never been found.) He could, however, rule out natural causes. There were three long superficial incisions on the abdomen that appeared to have been inflicted after death. There was a horizontal stab wound on the abdomen that had probably been inflicted before death, but it did not penetrate the stomach or intestines. The right hand appeared to have been sawed off and the left one cut off with a knife. The head was probably removed by using both a knife and saw. Dr. Luibel could not say whether the victim was alive or dead when her head was cut off. The small amount of hemorrhage at the wrists suggested that the victim was probably dead when her hands were cut off. The body was still in full rigor mortis at 4 p.m. on May 31, 1979, when Dr. Luibel examined it. Death would have occurred about 16 hours before then—about midnight the night before.

Terry Buchanan, the victim's husband, testified that his wife had given birth to a baby boy three weeks before her death and that she was still nursing him on May 30, 1979. That day Mrs. Buchanan left the house about 6:30 p.m. to go to a math class at Mesa College from 7 to 10 p.m. She was wearing tan levis, a beige and brown T-shirt, and was carrying a brown simulated leather purse. Mrs. Buchanan drove the family's only vehicle—a new blue van. There was very little gas in the tank because Buchanan planned to have the tank replaced the next day. Since Buchanan used the van during the day for his dental supply sales work, the van contained dental equipment and supplies. Buchanan said his wife was very security conscious and customarily locked the van. He also said that everything in the van was in good condition when she left.

Mrs. Buchanan was last seen alive walking toward the parking lot from her math class about 9:30 p.m. Fellow students had given her copies of class notes for the classes she had missed because of the birth of her baby. Mrs. Buchanan had left class a little early because an optional quiz was given at 9:30 p.m.

At 1:52 a.m. (California time) on May 31, 1979, defendant called his girlfriend, Donna Hatch, in Terrell, Texas from his parents' home in San

sty sheriff arrived
te cord were tied
ig to some blood
iat they had been
anything else that

to determine the
head and hands
ral causes. There
appeared to have
and on the abdo-
did not penetrate
e been sawed off
ably removed by
ether the victim
mount of hemor-
/ dead when her
t 4 p.m. on May
e occurred about

wife had given
iat she was still
the house about
10 p.m. She was
arrying a brown
only vehicle—a
cause Buchanan
chanan used the
contained dental
curity conscious
g in the van was

arking lot from
n her copies of
rth of her baby.
tional quiz was

ndant called his
ts' home in San

Diego. He told Donna that he had a van and was planning to leave for Texas as soon as the gas stations opened in the morning.

There was a gasoline shortage at the time, and gas stations were only open for limited hours. Between 4:45 a.m. and 10:15 a.m. on May 31, 1979, defendant used Terry and Eleanore Buchanan's Visa card to buy gas in El Cajon, California. The card was used two more times that day to buy gas for the van—once in El Centro, California at a station that was open between 6 a.m. and 10 a.m., and once in Tucson, Arizona.

When defendant arrived at Donna Hatch's home in Terrell, Texas on the evening of June 1, 1979, the van was dirty, had a broken arm on the driver's chair, a broken mirror, and a broken wing window on the passenger side. Defendant took Donna with him on errands in the van on June 1, 2 and 3, 1979. Donna saw some credit cards in the name of Terry and Eleanore Buchanan in the compartment between the seats. Defendant used the credit cards to buy gas and food while Donna was with him.

On June 3, while Donna was in the van with defendant and her daughter, they saw a highway patrolman. When Donna turned back to talk to her daughter, defendant told her not to make any sudden moves because they could get shot. Later, defendant stopped at a pay phone to call his brother and his friend Clifford. Donna heard defendant tell his brother he had flown to Texas. Clifford testified that when defendant called him, he was watching a report on TV that the body of a white woman with her head and hands cut off had been found; he told defendant about it. Defendant seemed nervous when he returned from talking to Clifford. He told Donna that he thought he had killed a man, but he did not want to tell her any details because she might not want to have anything to do with him if he told her. Defendant said he would let the van sit a while to see if anybody paid attention to it. He also said he needed some Texas license plates. He asked Donna to go with him to a car lot, but she refused.

Donna broke up with defendant the next day. Defendant said that if Donna were upset about the fact that he had lied about his ex-wife being dead, he would kill his ex-wife. On June 6, defendant called Donna to discuss bringing her back to California to testify for him in a pending case. At one point, a friend of Donna's got on the phone. Defendant told Donna, "I'm going to kill you and your friend, too. And you won't know when I'll be around because I don't have to be driving this van, I can be in another vehicle." Donna never saw or talked to defendant after that phone call.

Defendant continued using the Buchanans' credit cards to buy gas, food and other items. It was stipulated that on June 6 defendant charged a saw,

screwdriver and set of wrenches at a local store, and on June 7, he bought a butcher knife and two shanks of twine at a variety store.

While driving the van in Oklahoma on June 8, 1979, defendant was stopped by a deputy sheriff. The deputy ran a check of the van's VIN number and learned that it belonged to the homicide victim. Defendant was arrested and taken to jail. On the way to the jail he passed a poster offering a reward for David L. Wall, alias "Spider."

On June 9, 1979, San Diego sheriff's deputies interviewed defendant in Oklahoma. They began by introducing themselves, saying that they had come to talk to defendant about the van. Defendant interrupted them, stating: "Yeah, the guy told me yesterday, one that pulled the gun on me, that it had been involved in a homicide, and uh . . . ." Defendant was then advised of his *Miranda* rights, which he waived. Defendant told the deputies he had left San Diego in the van with Spider and Fran, a white woman who had left her husband for Spider. Spider's real name was Calvin Spencer. Fran and Spider were presently in Shreveport, Louisiana. They had given defendant the van and credit cards when he had said he did not want to stay in Louisiana. Defendant was shown a picture of Eleanore Buchanan with her baby. He said it looked like Fran, but Fran was a little skinnier.[2] Defendant said "the only time I seen her" Fran was wearing light colored jeans and carrying a beige nonleather purse.

Enroute to San Diego, defendant was disturbed about his arrest for murder and kept saying it was not going to stick because all the police had was a body they could not identify and a runaway wife.[3]

Shortly after defendant's preliminary hearing, Terry Buchanan received a letter with defendant's county jail return address. It said, "You are probably full of grief when you should be highly pissed-off . . ." because Fran was not dead but had left with Spider and was smoking Sherman Sticks. Buchanan turned the letter over to the district attorney's office.

Steven Thomas, an inmate at the San Diego County jail, testified that on January 24, 1980, he had a conversation with defendant about his case. He asked defendant, "Who are you trying to convince, Hamilton, me or yourself?" Defendant replied, "Well, I did it but they'll never prove it." Thomas reported the conversation to the guard. Thomas had been convicted of

[2]Fran was Eleanore Buchanan's nickname. It was on the school papers she had been carrying and on an unmailed birth announcement that had been in her purse.

[3]The body was, in fact, quickly identified by a number of distinctive features, which included moles, toenail polish, scars, recent episiotomy, and the nursing bra.

ane 7, he bought

, defendant was
van's VIN num-
. Defendant was
a poster offering

wed defendant in
ng that they had
upted them, stat-
: gun on me, that
endant was then
told the deputies
hite woman who
Calvin Spencer.
They had given
I not want to stay
e Buchanan with
le skinnier.[2] De-
ing light colored

is arrest for mur-
ne police had was

uchanan received
, "You are prob-
." because Fran
Sherman Sticks.
ffice.

l, testified that on
bout his case. He
lton, me or your-
prove it." Thom-
been convicted of

papers she had been
purse.
tive features, which
ing bra.

murder, robbery, forgery, burglary and escape. Thomas testified he was in the federal witness protection program against organized crime, but had not received any money from the United States with respect to that program.

While transporting defendant between the jail and courtroom on August 21, 1979, Deputy Sheriff Parsons was tightening defendant's security chains. Defendant said, "All right, you have your fun, I'll have mine later." Parsons responded, "I thought you already had your fun." Defendant replied, "Yeah, and I'll kill a lot more, too, and you may be first on my list."

Brandon Armstrong, a criminalist, testified that the blue fibers that had been on the victim's body could easily have come from the carpet in the victim's van. Blood on the carpet in the van matched the type and characteristics of the victim. Several hairs found in the carpet stains could have been hers. Armstrong also examined blood found on defendant's shoe and concluded that it had been smeared on when wet. The blood on defendant's shoe was type O—the victim's type.[4] Defendant's type was A.

A questioned documents expert testified that defendant was the person who had signed Terry Buchanan's name to the credit card invoices.

2. *Defense Case*

Defendant's mother testified that he was at her house between 8 and 9 p.m. on May 30, 1979. She said that although she testified at the preliminary hearing that she did not remember seeing defendant on the evening of May 30, 1979, she later spoke to defendant who refreshed her recollection by reminding her of some things that had happened that evening.[5]

Mary Brewer, a relative of defendant's who lived in Oklahoma City testified that defendant had visited her in the early part of June 1979. He gave her a ride in the van, and she did not remember seeing any blood in it.

Defendant testified that he had never seen the victim alive or dead. He said he went to his sister-in-law's house after he left his parent's house about 9 p.m. on May 30, 1979. He saw the Buchanans' van parked on a street between 12:45 and 1 a.m. on May 31, 1979, while walking home

[4]Armstrong testified on rebuttal that the blood on defendant's shoe could not have come from rubbing against the blood on the van's carpet.

[5]Defendant had written two letters to Donna Hatch after her preliminary hearing testimony attempting to refresh her recollection as to events that involved her.

from a 7-Eleven store after talking to Butch McIntyre.[6] The keys were in the ignition, the wing window was broken, and a purse was on the passenger seat. Defendant drove the van home, called Donna Hatch, put his clothes in it and left for Texas shortly before sunrise. Defendant said he broke the armrest on the driver's seat when he was moving from the passenger seat to the driver's seat. (The seats were swivel chairs with armrests.)

Defendant explained that he had told the officers in Oklahoma that he had driven across the country with Spider and Fran because he did not want to get stuck with an auto theft charge.

Defendant denied having threatened to kill Donna Hatch. He said he bought the saw and other items on June 6 before he spoke to Donna Hatch. He planned to use them to burglarize a store in Terrell. Defendant said he was attempting to distract Donna when he told her he thought he had killed someone; she was angry at him because she had just found out he had lied about his ex-wife being dead.

David Faulkner, an entomologist, testified about an experiment he had conducted in an attempt to determine when the victim's body had been left at the cul-de-sac. Faulkner took a rabbit, with its head and forepaws severed, and at midnight put it where the victim had been found. The purpose was to determine the amount of insect activity that would occur. Faulkner testified that within a few hours of sunrise there were a lot of flies around the rabbit. Based on this experiment and his knowledge of the temperature on the morning of May 31, 1979, Faulkner concluded that the earliest the body would have been put there would have been about 9 a.m. Faulkner admitted, however, that there is a great deal of variation in the degree to which insects are attracted to different human bodies.

Parker Bell, a criminalist testified that the blood on defendant's shoe was a smear, as opposed to a droplet or splatter. He thought the blood could have come from the carpet, but he acknowledged that there were no blue fibers in the blood. (The blue carpet shed badly.) On cross-examination, however, Bell admitted it was possible that the blood could have been smeared on defendant's shoe by having bumped one of the victim's bloody stumps.

Dr. Ali Hameli, Chief Medical Examiner of the State of Delaware, testified that in his opinion the victim died between 9:30 and 12 p.m. on May 30. Dr. Hameli also thought that rigor mortis was present when the body

[6]McIntyre testified he saw defendant after watching the NBA game on TV. There had, however, been no game on May 30. There had been one on May 29, 1979.

was placed at the cul-de-sac and that the body could have been put there no earlier than 4 a.m. on May 31.

Allen Biggs testified that he had been at the cul-de-sac about 10 a.m. on May 31, 1979. He had seen Mr. Piper's car but no body. Deputy Sheriff Crawford testified that tire tracks at the scene in the cul-de-sac did not match the tire tracks of the victim's van.[7]

II. Guilt Phase

1. *Faretta Motions*

(1a), (2a) Defendant contends that he was improperly denied his constitutional right to represent himself on two occasions. **(1b)** The first motion was made during a section 1538.5/995 hearing, which began on March 24, 1980, and ended on May 21, 1980. At that time trial was set for June 23, 1980. On April 25, defendant's appointed counsel, Thomas Ryan and Vivian Camberg, requested a continuance of the hearing in order to appear before the presiding judge and ask to be relieved. The court expressed some frustration about the delays caused by defendant's difficulties with counsel and noted that defendant had just appeared before the presiding judge and been denied his request to have counsel relieved. The court nevertheless granted the continuance, and the presiding judge heard and denied counsel's motion. Defendant then renewed his motion to relieve counsel, which was also denied.

On May 1, defendant filed a motion to relieve counsel and to proceed in pro. per. At the hearing on the motion on May 9, defendant decided to withdraw his pro. per. motion and instead requested that he be given co-counsel status. The request was granted. On May 20, however, at the time scheduled for resumption of the section 1538.5/995 hearing, defendant requested to have his counsel relieved and new counsel appointed. Defendant stated that if that motion were denied, he would then renew his motion to proceed in pro. per. The court listened to defendant's complaints about counsel and counsel's response and denied the motion to relieve counsel. It also denied the motion to proceed in pro. per. "on the 995," noting that the court was in the middle of a hearing that had begun two months earlier and had already produced several days of testimony. The court cited defendant's inadequate knowledge of the legal principles involved. Before ruling on the motion, the court noted the great difficulty there would be in

[7]Crawford had testified for the prosecution and had identified photos that showed drag marks from the roadway to where the body had been found. The drag marks appeared to start on the pavement.

finding any other lawyer to come in at this stage of the proceedings. The prosecutor objected to any further delays and urged the court to proceed, noting that he had witnesses scheduled to appear.

No error appears in the trial court's denial of defendant's motion to proceed in pro. per. In *People* v. *Windham* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 121 [137 Cal.Rptr. 8, 137 P.2d 1187], we held that unless such a motion is made within a reasonable time before commencement of trial, it does not invoke the constitutionally mandated unconditional right of self-representation, but puts the matter within the court's discretion. The motion here was untimely within the context of this protracted section 1538.5/995 hearing. Accordingly, the court properly exercised its discretion under *Windham* in denying the motion on the ground that defendant had not stated a valid reason for relieving counsel and was grasping at anything to delay the proceedings. The fact that the court may also have referred to defendant's lack of legal ability—an irrelevant consideration under *Faretta*—does not detract from the validity of its other reasons for denying the motion.

(2b) On October 14, 1980, defendant filed another written motion to proceed in pro. per. On October 20, however, he requested that his motion be taken off calendar, stating that he wanted to keep trying to get along with counsel and that he did not think that pro. per. status was the answer to his problems.[8] Defendant revived his motion on November 3, alleging inadequate representation by counsel. At that time, however, the jury had been selected and counsel were ready to give their opening statements. The court held an ex parte in camera session to hear and discuss defendant's complaints about counsel: Counsel's failure to keep him informed of discovery, counsel's decision to have a de novo section 1538.5 hearing, lack of communication, and inadequate investigation. Counsel responded with apparently satisfactory explanations on all counts.

After more than one and a half hours of discussion about defendant's difficulties with counsel, the court had the prosecutor join the proceedings and indicated that it was going to deny the motion to relieve counsel. The court stated that the reasons for defendant's request seemed groundless. It felt that defendant would be unable to adequately represent himself; he would have difficulty in communicating due to his soft voice, and he did not have sufficient objectivity to cope with examining witnesses and address-

[8]The problems he referred to were his continual dissatisfaction with counsel's strategic decisions, asserted difficulty in communicating with counsel, and counsel's alleged failure to keep him informed of all discovery. Defendant stated these complaints on a number of occasions, and the record is replete with discussions between the court, defendant and his counsel about their problems. Defendant was constantly second-guessing counsel on strategic decisions.

: proceedings. The
: court to proceed,

st's motion to pro-
Cal.3d 121 [137
a motion is made
it does not invoke
representation, but
here was untimely
hearing. Accord-
indham in denying
a valid reason for
the proceedings.
ant's lack of legal
not detract from

written motion to
ed that his motion
; to get along with
the answer to his
3, alleging inade-
the jury had been
:ments. The court
defendant's com-
ned of discovery,
ing, lack of com-
nded with appar-

ibout defendant's
i the proceedings
eve counsel. The
ed groundless. It
sent himself; he
oice, and he did
sses and address-

s counsel's strategic
sel's alleged failure
ints on a number of
t, defendant and his
g counsel on strateg-

ing the court. The court noted that defendant was receiving high-quality representation and had a proclivity to substitute counsel. It further noted that it had already tak.. four weeks to select the jury. Defendant reminded the court that he was not asking for a continuance.

This motion, too, was properly denied under *Windham*. Since the jury had already been selected at the time defendant revived his motion, it was not timely for purposes of having an absolute right of self-representation under *Faretta* v. *California* (1975) 422 U.S. 806 [45 L.Ed.2d 562, 95 S.Ct. 2525]. (See *People* v. *Harris* (1977) 73 Cal.App.3d 76 [140 Cal.Rptr. 697] [motion made after jury selection underway]; *People* v. *Hall* (1978) 87 Cal.App.3d 125 [150 Cal.Rptr. 628] [motion made right before jury selection]; *People* v. *Hill* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 744 [196 Cal.Rptr. 382] [motion made at beginning of trial before jury selection].) The fact that defendant did not ask for a continuance is not determinative. (See *People* v. *Hill*, *supra*, 148 Cal.App.3d 744.) *Windham* lists a number of factors for the court to consider in exercising its discretion: "the quality of counsel's representation of the defendant, the defendant's prior proclivity to substitute counsel, the reasons for the request, the length and stage of the proceedings, and the disruption or delay which might reasonably be expected to follow the granting of such a motion." (19 Cal.3d at p. 128.) The court considered those factors and acted within its discretion in denying defendant's request. Again, the court's reference to impermissible factors—such as defendant's lack of legal knowledge and his soft voice—does not invalidate the rest of its reasoning.

2. *Shackling*

(3a) On September 18, 1980, before the trial started, defendant appeared with his counsel at an in camera hearing to discuss whether he should be shackled at trial. Counsel reported to the court that defendant had attacked his assistant 10 days earlier while she was meeting with defendant in a jail holding cell. Then, on the night before the hearing, defendant had punched counsel in the mouth while he was visiting defendant in jail. Counsel stated he had no doubts about defendant's mental competency and that he thought defendant was merely "acting out" as a result of his frustration. Counsel, however, believed that defendant would continue such behavior and feared its effect on the jury if such outbursts occurred at trial. He therefore requested that defendant be shackled during trial in order to avoid the possibility of the extreme prejudice that would result from the anticipated outbursts. Defendant objected to shackling and reminded the court that he had never caused a problem in his previous court appearances. Although the court did not rule on the issue of shackling at that time, defendant appeared

at later pretrial hearings in shackles, apparently as a result of a security decision made by the sheriff's department.

On September 24, still before trial, defendant and counsel appeared at another in camera hearing. At this hearing, which was basically held to consider defendant's motion to proceed in pro. per., defendant requested removal of the shackles (particularly those on his arms) to enable him to handle his papers and to take notes. Counsel, however, requested that the shackles remain on during the argument. He reiterated his position that he felt it was in defendant's best interests to be shackled from the beginning of trial rather than take the chance of the extreme prejudice resulting from an outburst at trial and the midtrial appearance of shackles. Defendant again objected, citing the discomfort and inconvenience of shackles and the fact that he had never caused a problem in his many other court appearances in this case.

On October 2, before jury selection was to begin, another in camera hearing was held at defense counsel's request. Counsel stated that he had reconsidered the matter after discussions with defendant and with other attorneys. He now felt that defendant should be allowed to start trial without shackles. Counsel said he believed that defendant intended to behave at trial and noted that defendant had not disrupted any proceedings in the past. After hearing from defendant and checking with jail authorities, the court concluded that defendant should be unshackled but that he would still have to wear a knee brace which would not be visible to the jury. Jury selection began later that day.

At the next court session on October 6, defendant complained about the discomfort of the knee brace. The court took the matter under submission and concluded later that day that defendant should start trial without any restraints.

On October 8, however, while jury selection was still in progress, the court held another in camera hearing on the question of shackling. A sheriff's deputy was sworn as a witness and related an incident that had happened at the jail that morning: Defendant was reminded at 6, 7:20 and 7:40 a.m. that he was to go to court and should get ready. Defendant was still in bed when the deputies arrived to take him to court. When they removed his blanket, defendant jumped up and took a fighting stance. He was subdued, but he continued to struggle and be uncooperative as he was being moved from jail. Ultimately the deputies had to drag him part way. Defendant called the deputies cowards and asked them to remove the chains and fight him "one on one." Another deputy testified that while at the holding cell, defendant again became abusive and proceeded to remove all

sult of a security

nsel appeared at
asically held to
endant requested
to enable him to
equested that the
position that he
m the beginning
e resulting from
Defendant again
kles and the fact
r appearances in

other in camera
ated that he had
d with other at-
tart trial without
to behave at trial
ngs in the past.
rities, the court
would still have
. Jury selection

lained about the
nder submission
rial without any

n progress, the
ckling. A sher-
t that had hap-
, 7:20 and 7:40
endant was still
n they removed
e. He was sub-
s he was being
part way. De-
nove the chains
at while at the
d to remove all

of his clothes. He came to court wrapped in a blanket. Defense counsel cross-examined the deputies, and defendant gave his version of the incident.

After argument by defense counsel against shackling and by the prosecutor for shackling, the court concluded that defendant should be shackled. It cited the pattern of increased agitation by defendant despite its efforts to accommodate defendant's problems with jail routine: "'Mr. Hamilton has obtained the privileges over and above those privileges granted to other prisoners in the jail. He has a private cell, private telephone, he is able to work on his case, being co-counsel in the case. He has chosen to defy orders that have been made by officers in the jail. He has refused to dress to come to court. He is coming into court with jail garb and apparently a blanket thrown over his body and one shoe on and one shoe off, apparently. He has defied all authority and I think it is just a matter of time before he would begin to defy all authority here in the courtroom. I am going to take the steps that are necessary to make certain that doesn't happen. I am going to require that he be in chains, his ankles and hands, for the trial. I regret the necessity to do it. I regret that Mr. Hamilton brought this upon himself. But I find no alternative. I am not going to subject anybody in this courtroom to any possible injury or violent confrontation. This case is going to be tried in an orderly and a quiet and judicial manner.'"

Defendant contends the court abused its discretion in ordering him to be shackled during trial because there was no showing of manifest need. In *People* v. *Duran* (1976) 16 Cal.3d 282 [127 Cal.Rptr. 618, 545 P.2d 1322, 90 A.L.R.3d 1], we held that the court had abused its discretion in ordering a defendant shackled without a showing on the record of a manifest need for such restraints: "There is no showing that defendant threatened to escape or behaved violently before coming to court or while in court." (*Id.*, at p. 293.) We noted that a trial court must make the decision to use physical restraints on a case-by-case basis and that such a determination, when made in accordance with the procedures specified (hearing outside jury's presence with court making due process determination regarding necessity for restraints of record), "cannot be successfully challenged on review except on a showing of a manifest abuse of discretion." (*Id.*, at p. 293, fn. 12.)

No abuse of discretion is shown here. The trial court followed the dictates of *Duran:* it held a hearing, heard testimony by the deputies and by defendant, and made an on-the-record determination of the necessity for ordering defendant shackled. The fact that defendant had made numerous earlier appearances without disruption does not dispel the present threat that the court found based on defendant's current actions. Defendant's reliance on *People* v. *Jackle* (1978) 77 Cal.App.3d 878 [144 Cal.Rptr. 23], is misplaced for

the decision there was not based on the judge's independent determination of the need to shackle or on the defendant's conduct while in custody.

Defendant's complaints about the court's earlier decision to shackle him based on his counsel's request are no longer pertinent since counsel changed his mind before trial and the court acceded to counsel's plea for removal of the shackles. Although fault might be found with counsel's reasoning in requesting shackling in the first instance—that is, to saddle defendant with the certainty of prejudice from appearing before the jury in shackles in order to avoid the *possibility* of prejudice from an outburst at trial—the matter became moot before trial ever commenced. Defendant's complaints about the procedure employed in those earlier hearings on shackling are also moot.

3. *Evidentiary Issues*

a. *Exhibits 91, 92, 93*

(4a) Defendant contends the trial court prejudicially erred in admitting three letters he wrote in 1973 while in prison (exhibits 91, 92, 93). Two of the letters were written to a superior court judge asking him to reconsider the prison sentence he had imposed, and offering, in return for such condition, to provide information about crimes committed by others. The third letter was to the district attorney's office pleading for release from prison in exchange for providing information about recent crimes. In this letter defendant listed a number of alleged crimes and purported perpetrators, including his own brother.[9]

The People sought to introduce these letters and evidence of a 1972 burglary of a van at Mesa College on the issue of identity. The People's theory was that Eleanore Buchanan interrupted defendant while he was breaking into her van. The reason that he killed her rather than just running off—as

[9]Exhibit 91 asked the judge to consider reducing defendant's sentence to county time. Defendant mentioned his cooperation with a police officer in solving "robberies, burglaries, drugs as well as firearms." Defendant said he had been threatened because of it and was afraid to come out of his cell.
Exhibit 92 again asked the judge to reconsider his prison sentence, again mentioned his help to the police and fear from threats made against him. Defendant stated: "Sir, I want to say this, there are a lot of crimes I've seen and know about where they involve instances of dangering people's lives and where people have committed bodily harm to people. I also know the big drug dealers. I know of several arsons of firearms and I'm willing to prove I'm still trying to turn straight, by giving this information to the police department."
Exhibit 93 asked the district attorney to help him get released on special probation in return for providing information about crimes. It listed about 33 crimes (robbery, burglary, drug offenses) committed in the Kearny Mesa area and the persons responsible. This list includes robberies and burglaries committed by defendant's brother.

ent determination
e in custody.

on to shackle him
s counsel changed
ea for removal of
el's reasoning in
le defendant with
shackles in order
trial—the matter
complaints about
nackling are also

rred in admitting
, 92, 93). Two of
him to reconsider
rn for such con-
others. The third
ease from prison
es. In this letter
ted perpetrators,

ce of a 1972 bur-
e People's theory
he was breaking
t running off—as

nce to county time.
obberies, burglaries,
ecause of it and was

again mentioned his
stated: "Sir, I want
ey involve instances
arm to people. I also
I'm willing to prove
department."
special probation in
(robbery, burglary,
esponsible. This list

a normal burglar would have done—was defendant's deathly fear of returning to prison. Defendant had been sent to prison in 1973 after two eyewitnesses to the 1972 burglary had testified against him. Defendant's letters revealed that he was terrified of prison and indicated the lengths to which he would go—turning in his own brother—to avoid prison.

The defense objected, asserting that the letters actually showed only defendant's criminal disposition and in any event should be excluded under Evidence Code section 352.[10] As to the 1972 burglary, the defense contended that there were insufficient distinctive similarities between it and the present crime to warrant an inference that they were committed by the same person.

The trial court ruled that the 1972 burglary would not be admitted because it did not share sufficiently distinctive common marks with the current crime. The three letters, however, were ruled admissible on the issue of motive and identity. The court suggested that counsel meet and try to agree on excising portions of the letters that may be irrelevant. Counsel, however, were unable to agree on excising anything more than the names of the judges and district attorney to whom the letters were addressed and the details of the burglary conviction. Defense counsel wanted the details of defendant's information about other crimes excised, but the court agreed with the prosecutor that these details were necessary to demonstrate the severity of defendant's fear of prison and the lengths to which he would go to avoid prison.

(5a) Evidence of a defendant's prior criminal acts is, of course, inadmissible under Evidence Code section 1101 unless it is "relevant to prove some fact (such as motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident) other than his disposition to commit such acts." (Evid. Code, § 1101, subd. (b).) The factual relevance, however, must pertain to some issue that is "actually in dispute," and even then the court must exercise its discretion under Evidence Code section 352 and exclude the evidence if its relevancy to prove the disputed fact is not of sufficient probative value to outweigh the manifest prejudice of such evidence. (*People* v. *Thompson* (1980) 27 Cal.3d 303, 314-321 [165 Cal.Rptr. 289, 611 P.2d 883].)

[10]These issues were raised during a pretrial hearing. It is not clear whether the trial court was aware that the only murder theory the People would later assert was felony murder. The matter was not mentioned by either side at the hearing. Defendant now argues that since only felony murder was used, there was no issue as to intent. He does not state whether the trial court was aware of that fact at the time of its pretrial ruling. In any event, the court's ruling was based on the relevance of the letters to show motive and identity.

(4b) Defendant challenges the admissibility of the evidence at every level of analysis. He asserts that it did not tend to show a motive and that even if it did, the motive was not material to any disputed issue. He points out that there was no issue of intent since the only theory of murder presented was felony murder, which requires no finding of intent to kill. He notes that most of the cases which have allowed motive evidence have involved an issue of intent. (See, e.g., *People* v. *Robillard* (1960) 55 Cal.2d 88 [10 Cal.Rptr. 167, 358 P.2d 295, 83 A.L.R.2d 1086]; *People* v. *Durham* (1969) 70 Cal.2d 171 [74 Cal.Rptr. 262, 449 P.2d 198]; *People* v. *Powell* (1974) 40 Cal.App.3d 107 [115 Cal.Rptr. 109]; *People* v. *Vidaurri* (1980) 103 Cal.App.3d 450 [163 Cal.Rptr. 57].)

Defendant relies heavily on *People* v. *Alcala* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 604 [205 Cal.Rptr. 775, 685 P.2d 1126], where we found the admission of evidence of prior child molestation offenses by the defendant to have been reversible error. The evidence was not admissible on the issue of identity because there were no sufficiently distinctive similarities between the charged and uncharged crimes to warrant an inference of having been committed by the same person. We also held that the evidence was not admissible to establish a motive for premeditated murder on the ground that the defendant's prior crimes increased his incentive to eliminate the victim as a witness since the prior convictions would aggravate the penalty for the current offense. We refused to adopt such reasoning because it would mean that "one's criminal past could always be introduced against him." (*Id.*, at p. 635.) We distinguished *Durham* and *Robillard* on the ground that the motive of escape was central in those cases where the defendants shot and killed police officers during routine automobile stops.

We agree that it was error to admit these letters. The proffered motive of killing eyewitnesses because of defendant's extreme fear of prison simply does not wash. It rests entirely on speculation on how an assumed "normal" burglar would have behaved after being discovered, which, in turn, is based entirely on speculation on how such a "normal" burglar would have weighed the possibility of going to prison against the problems associated with the taking of a human life. The jury is then asked to compare this supposed reaction of a "normal" burglar with the assumed reaction of a person who dislikes prison with the intensity which the defendant's letters imply. It is difficult to imagine a more tenuous chain of inferences on which to base a finding that one person has killed another.

We cannot, however, say that the error in admitting the evidence was prejudicial. At worst the letters showed defendant's prison connection and his knowledge of crime life in San Diego, but they were not in the same league of prejudice as the evidence of molestations in *Alcala*. Even without

vidence at every
a motive and that
l issue. He points
y of murder pre-
intent to kill. He
vidence have in-
(1960) 55 Cal.2d
People v. Durham
People v. Powell
. Vidaurri (1980)

Cal.3d 604 [205
ssion of evidence
e been reversible
identity because
the charged and
ommitted by the
sible to establish
defendant's prior
witness since the
rent offense. We
"one's criminal
635.) We distin-
ve of escape was
d police officers

ffered motive of
of prison simply
umed "normal"
in turn, is based
lar would have
blems associated
to compare this
ed reaction of a
fendant's letters
rences on which

e evidence was
connection and
not in the same
e. Even without

the letters, we still would have known that defendant had been convicted of forgery in 1972 and burglary in 1973 and that he had a felony case pending when he went to Texas.[11] There is also strong circumstantial evidence of defendant's guilt. In addition to his admission to a jailer and a jailhouse informant, we have defendant driving the victim's van and using her credit cards. We also have a spot of blood on defendant's shoe that is the victim's blood type but not defendant's.

Defendant's admitted fabrication of the "Fran and Spider" story and his explanation for its retraction furnish almost unanswerable evidence of consciousness of guilt with respect to the very victim of the homicide, as well as contact with her.

First, with respect to the explanation: at the outset of the Oklahoma interview defendant had been told that the van had been involved in a homicide. Making up a provably false story just to avoid being accused of having stolen the van, seems extravagant.

More important, however, is the fact that defendant was not told anything about the victim of the homicide. Yet his admittedly false story attempted to account for the whereabouts of the actual victim whose body, as defendant believed, could not be identified. Further, once it was conceded that the "Fran and Spider" story was a lie, defendant's ability to identify the victim from the picture showing her with her baby, as well as his correct description of her clothes and purse, prove some kind of contact with her. Conversely, none of the defense evidence—except defendant's bare denials—was conclusively inconsistent with the People's case.

Under the circumstances, it does not appear reasonably probable that the jury would have reached a more favorable result had these letters not been admitted. (*People* v. *Watson* (1956) 46 Cal.2d 818, 836 [299 P.2d 243].)

b. *Statement to Deputy Parsons*

(6a) Defendant contends the trial court prejudicially erred in admitting evidence of the statement defendant made to Deputy Sheriff Parsons: "Yeah, and I'll kill a lot more, too, and you may be first on my list."

[11]Donna Hasch's testimony referred to the fact that there was such a case pending against defendant when he went to Texas; it will be recalled that he wanted her to testify for him. Defendant's 1972 forgery and 1973 burglary convictions were ruled admissible for impeachment purposes under *People* v. *Beagle* (1972) 6 Cal.3d 441 [99 Cal.Rptr. 313, 492 P.2d 1] and were so used.

It seems quite clear that defendant's decision to testify was not compelled by the erroneous admission of these letters. There was far more damaging evidence that defendant needed to explain if he were to have any chance of acquittal—the fabricated story about Fran and Spider, his statements and threats to Donna Hasch, and his possession of the victim's van.

Before Deputy Parsons' testimony in front of the jury, an in camera hearing was held on the admissibility of the statement. Counsel objected on the grounds that the statement was solicited by the deputy in violation of *Massiah* and *Miranda*, that it was ambiguous and did not constitute a threat or admission. The court ruled that there had been no interrogation by Deputy Parsons and that the statement was admissible as an admission. Defense counsel then sought to have the last portion excluded—the statement "you may be first on my list." The court denied the request on the ground that the entire statement was needed to show its essence.

Defendant does not challenge the court's finding of no interrogation. He contends only that the statement was too ambiguous to constitute an admission. The trial court properly rejected defendant's contention. Even though no Evidence Code section 352 objection was raised, the court would not have abused its discretion in admitting the evidence over such an objection. Although defendant did not mention any specific victims, he did admit to having killed someone. Defendant's reliance on *People* v. *Allen* (1976) 65 Cal.App.3d 426 [135 Cal.Rptr. 276] is misplaced because the statement there required too many levels of speculation to be construed as an admission *of guilt*.[13] The statement here, by contrast, required no speculation to connect it to the issue of whether defendant had killed Mrs. Buchanan.

c. Letter to Theresa Roch

(7a) Defendant contends that the trial court prejudicially erred in admitting a letter—not previously mentioned—written by him to Theresa Roch. He claims that there was no evidence to show that he had authorized the threat to witnesses referred to in the letter. During argument on the admissibility of the letter, defense counsel conceded that a foundation had been laid and stated that he would have no objection to the letter being received into evidence if the portion referring to the threats were excised. That portion read: "By the way, today I got news from Quack. He says he knows I am innocent but also knows how I will get railroaded, so if I lose

[13]In *Allen*, the defendant was charged with the theft of jewelry that was missing after he had spent the night with the victim. The defendant had awakened the victim during the night and told her that someone had been in the apartment and that he had chased the intruder out. Over the defendant's objection, the victim testified that defendant had stated he had ways of finding out where the stolen jewelry was if anyone attempted to sell it, and that he made a phone call in which he stated that he wanted to be informed if the jewelry was sold. The testimony was admitted on the theory that such statements constituted an implied admission that the defendant and a confederate had stolen the jewelry, but, after second thoughts, were attempting to return it to the victim.

The Court of Appeal held the statements were improperly admitted as an implied admission of defendant that he had stolen the jewelry because any inference to that effect was too speculative and unreasonable to meet the test of relevance. (*People* v. *Allen*, *supra*, 65 Cal.App.3d at pp. 433-435.)

', an in camera hear-
unsel objected on the
in violation of *Mas-*
constitute a threat or
rrogation by Deputy
admission. Defense
–the statement "you
t on the ground that

no interrogation. He
constitute an admis-
ention. Even though
the court would not
er such an objection.
ms, he did admit to
e v. *Allen* (1976) 65
cause the statement
nstrued as an admis-
ed no speculation to
Mrs. Buchanan.

dicially erred in ad-
by him to Theresa
at he had authorized
ng argument on the
hat a foundation had
n to the letter being
hreats were excised.
n Quack. He says he
ilroaded, so if I lose

that was missing after he
e victim during the night
had chased the intruder
ndant had stated he had
ed to sell it, and that he
d if the jewelry was sold.
onstituted an implied ad-
welry, but, after second

ted as an implied admis-
nce to that effect was too
ople v. *Allen*, *supra*, 65

this case, they will take out O'Connor [defense attorney], Sexton [prosecutor], McArdle [prosecutor] and Armstrong [criminalist], and at least one member of their family. [¶] I don't like the idea of violence, since I have never been a violent person, and the proposal seeks my agreement. I haven't sent answers as of yet, because I have to consider a lot of things before I do. [¶] I don't like the idea, but I also don't like the idea of sitting on someone's murder charge, so that leaves me a lot to think about. Anyway, time has finally slowed down, but now, there is a lot going on."

The prosecutor asserted that the letter was relevant to show an attempt to intimidate the prosecutors and the criminalist. He noted that defendant had mentioned in an earlier letter to Terry Buchanan that he knew the authorities were copying his mail. In light of this knowledge, the mention of the threat—despite defendant's stated reluctance to agree to it—constituted an attempt to intimidate the persons mentioned. The court apparently agreed and admitted the letter.

Defendant relies on *People* v. *Hannon* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 588 [138 Cal.Rptr. 885, 564 P.2d 1203] and *People* v. *Weiss* (1958) 50 Cal.2d 535 [327 P.2d 527] in asserting that the letter should not have been admitted in the absence of evidence indicating that he had authorized the threats by "Quack." Defendant misunderstands the basis on which the letter was admitted. It was the fact that defendant knew that his letter would be copied and read by the authorities that transformed the reference to threats by "Quack" into a subtle attempt at intimidation by defendant.

Defendant also asserts that the court should have excluded the letter under Evidence Code section 352 even though that claim was never raised at trial. He presents no pertinent authority in support of the assertion that the trial court had a sua sponte duty to consider exclusion under section 352.

d. Admission of Saw, Knife and Twine

(8a) Defendant contends the court prejudicially erred in admitting a saw (pruning type), butcher knife and two shanks of twine that he had bought in Texas on June 6 and 7, after the murder of Mrs. Buchanan. At the hearing on the admissibility of the items, defense counsel argued that they were only marginally relevant to defendant's threats to kill Donna Hatch and that it would be impossible for the jury to limit its consideration to their relevance to threats against Hatch.

The prosecutor argued that the evidence had two purposes. The first was a narrow one of showing defendant's consciousness of guilt in that defendant bought these items to use in killing Donna Hatch, who, after their fall-

ing-out, had become a serious threat as a witness because of the incriminating things defendant had said to her. Defendant's consciousness of guilt was also shown by the fact that when questioned after his arrest, he denied any connection with the saw, claiming "Spider must have bought it."

The larger purpose of the evidence was to show defendant's identity as the killer of Mrs. Buchanan. The items, which inferably were to be used in killing Donna Hatch, were similar to the tools used on Mrs. Buchanan—dead or alive.

The court acknowledged the potential prejudice but concluded that the probative value of the evidence was sufficient to warrant its admission in light of the unusual factors of the cutting off of the victim's head and hands: "The circumstances are about as unique and different as any case that I have ever seen, and there are certain earmarks of the case that seem to be closely related with the possibility that the defendant may have intended to do something along the same lines to some other person who was standing in his way; that is, who was a threat to him as far as his liberty was concerned, and it is so unusual that it seems to be a circumstance which might well show a consciousness on the part of the defendant of his guilt . . . ."

The cases on which defendant relies are distinguishable from the present situation in that they involved the admission of weapons found in the defendant's possession that could not have been the ones used in the crime and were not admitted for any other relevant purpose. (*People* v. *Riser* (1956) 47 Cal.2d 566 [305 P.2d 1]; *People* v. *Henderson* (1976) 58 Cal.App.3d 349 [129 Cal.Rptr. 844].) No abuse of discretion appears in the court's ruling here.

e. *Preliminary Hearing Testimony of Steve Terry*

(9a) Defendant contends he was denied his right of confrontation by the use of one Steve Terry's preliminary hearing testimony at trial. Terry was an employee of Stuckey's in Oklahoma where defendant had used one of the victim's credit cards. He had testified that defendant ran out of the store before approval for the credit card purchase could be obtained. Terry notified the police and gave a description of defendant and the vehicle. It was this call that ultimately led to defendant's arrest.

Terry had been a cooperative witness. The district attorney's investigator had been in regular touch with him and had served him with a subpoena by mail. His last contact with Terry was July 15, 1980, when he advised Terry that the August 12, 1980, trial date had been continued. The investigator learned two weeks before trial that Terry was no longer employed by the

Stuckey Corporation, that he and his wife had separated and that he had left the town of Marietta, Oklahoma. An Oklahoma sheriff's department employee testified that she had attempted unsuccessfully to locate Terry. She had checked with the post office, the electric company and had attempted to contact Terry's wife's parents.

Defendant contends the trial court erred in finding that the prosecution had exercised due diligence since it never used the Uniform Act to Secure Attendance of Witnesses. He relies on *People* v. *Blackwood* (1983) 138 Cal.App.3d 939 [188 Cal.Rptr. 359], where the Court of Appeal held that the trial court had erred in finding a witness unavailable when the prosecution had made vigorous efforts to find the witness but had not attempted to use the uniform act.

The present situation is distinguishable from that in *Blackwood* where the witness had been located but refused to cut short an Alaskan vacation to appear at trial. In *Blackwood*, the prosecutors had made no effort to use the uniform act to obtain interstate process because they thought it unlikely that Alaska would have issued a subpoena because of the undue hardship on the witness. Here, by contrast, the prosecution had a cooperative witness who unexpectedly disappeared two weeks before trial. (Cf. *People* v. *Masters* (1982) 134 Cal.App.3d 509 [185 Cal.Rptr. 134] [prosecution unjustified in relying on uncooperative witness's promise to appear].) Since Terry could not be located after his unexpected disappearance, it would have been pointless to have used the uniform act. (See *Ohio* v. *Roberts* (1979) 448 U.S. 56 [65 L.Ed.2d 597, 100 S.Ct. 2531].)

In any event, any error in admitting Terry's preliminary hearing testimony was clearly harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. (See *People* v. *Blackwood*, *supra*, 138 Cal.App.3d at p. 947.) Terry's testimony was peripheral and could not have affected the verdict.

4. *Special Circumstance Findings*

(10a) Defendant contends that the special circumstance findings must be set aside and the penalty reversed for the court's error under *Carlos* v. *Superior Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131 [197 Cal.Rptr. 79, 672 P.2d 862], in failing to instruct on the necessity for intent to kill in the felony-murder special circumstances. We agree. **(11a)** In *People* v. *Garcia* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 539 [205 Cal.Rptr. 265, 684 P.2d 826], we held *Carlos* error reversible per se with four limited exceptions: (1) if the erroneous instruction was given in connection with an offense for which the defendant was acquitted; (2) if the defendant conceded the issue of intent; (3) if the factual question posed by the instruction was necessarily resolved adversely to the

defendant under other, properly given instructions, (4) where the evidence establishes intent to kill as a matter of law and shows no evidence to the contrary that is worthy of consideration. (*Id.*, at pp. 554-556.)

(10b) In this case the only theory of murder on which the jury was instructed was felony murder which, of course, does not require a finding of intent to kill. Thus the only potentially relevant exception to the *Garcia* rule of automatic reversal is the fourth—the so-called *Thornton-Cantrell* exception. The evidence does not support its application here. As noted, the coroner was unable to determine the cause of death or whether the victim's head and hands were cut off before or after death. The one stab wound that had been inflicted before death was nonfatal. Although the evidence would arguably support a finding of intent to kill had proper instructions been given, it manifestly does not establish intent to kill as a matter of law. The victim might have been killed accidentally, with defendant deciding afterwards to mutilate the body in an attempt to prevent identification.[13] We simply do not have enough evidence as to the circumstances of the victim's death to be able to conclude that intent to kill was established as a matter of law.

III. Disposition

The findings of special circumstances are set aside and the judgment is reversed insofar as it relates to penalty; in all other respects the judgment is affirmed.

Broussard, J., and Reynoso, J., concurred.

GRODIN, J.—(1c), (2c), (3b), (4c), (5b-9b), (10c), (11b) I agree that the principles this court adopted in *People* v. *Garcia* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 539 [205 Cal.Rptr. 265, 684 P.2d 826], which were in turn based on federal constitutional principles, compel reversal of the special circumstances finding for *Carlos* error, and I therefore concur.

Justice Lucas' dissent is appealing.[1] However the killing occurred, the circumstances were certainly brutal, and from the record on review I agree

[13]The fact that the victim's wrists and ankles had been tied does not alter this; death could have occurred accidentally while she was tied up.

[1]Part of what I say here is applicable also to the concurring and dissenting opinion by Justice Mosk. Justice Mosk accepts both *Carlos* and *Garcia*, but would affirm the judgment on the ground that intent to kill was "manifest from the facts and no evidence was introduced by defendant that might raise a reasonable doubt on that issue." He makes no attempt, however, to explain how this conclusion fits within the analytical framework of *Garcia*. (See discussion, *post*, pp. 435-436; compare *People* v. *Anderson* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 58, 61-62 [210 Cal.Rptr. 777, 694 P.2d 1149].)

where the evidence
no evidence to the
4-556.)

which the jury was
ot require a finding
ption to the *Garcia*
Thornton-Cantrell
here. As noted, the
whether the victim's
one stab wound that
the evidence would
r instructions been
matter of law. The
lant deciding after-
dentification.[13] We
ices of the victim's
blished as a matter

od the judgment is
pects the judgment

11b) I agree that
84) 36 Cal.3d 539
n based on federal
ircumstances find-

ling occurred, the
on review I agree

alter this; death could

dissenting opinion by
ld affirm the judgment
idence was introduced
e makes no attempt,
ework of *Garcia*. (See
38 Cal.3d 58, 61-62

that had the question of intent been put to the jury it is unlikely that its verdict would have been otherwise. From that perspective, the dissent's suggestion that the judgment does not represent a "miscarriage of justice" within the meaning of the California Constitution (art. VI, § 13) may well have merit.

But there are several flaws in the dissent's analysis. The first is its failure to recognize that *Garcia* is premised squarely on principles of *federal* constitutional law as declared by the United States Supreme Court in *Connecticut* v. *Johnson* (1983) 460 U.S. 73 [74 L.Ed.2d 823, 103 S.Ct. 969]. As we observed in *Garcia*, *Connecticut* v. *Johnson* reveals that "at least eight justices of the United States Supreme Court . . . agree that a jury instruction which does take an issue completely from the jury is reversible per se. We have no doubt that they would reach the same conclusion if the error was one of omission—failing to submit the issue of intent to the jury. Both forms of error have the same effect: removing the issue wholly from jury determination, and thus denying defendant the right to jury trial on the element of the charge." (*People* v. *Garcia*, *supra*, 36 Cal.3d at p. 554.) *Garcia* concluded that *Carlos* error is reversible per se subject to four familiar exceptions, one of which (the so-called *Cantrell-Thornton* exception) was not based upon any language in *Connecticut* v. *Johnson* but was, we thought, compatible with the principles announced in that case.

The Attorney General sought review of this court's decision in *Garcia* by petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, but review was denied. (469 U.S. 1229 [84 L.Ed.2d 366, 105 S.Ct. 1229].) Subsequently, the high court granted review in *Engle* v. *Koehler* (6th Cir. 1983), a case involving the test of prejudice for *Sandstrom* error (*Sandstrom* v. *Montana* (1979) 442 U.S. 510 [61 L.Ed.2d 39, 99 S.Ct. 2450] [in which the jury was instructed that "[t]he law presumed that a person intends the ordinary consequences of his voluntary acts"]), but the appeal in that case was summarily affirmed by an equally divided court. (*Koehler* v. *Engle* (1984) 466 U.S. 1 [80 L.Ed.2d 1, 104 S.Ct. 1673].) The high court has since avoided the same issue in *Francis* v. *Franklin* (1985) 471 U.S. 307, 325 [85 L.Ed.2d 344, 360, 105 S.Ct. 1965, 1977], and has declined to grant certiorari in another case posing the *Sandstrom-Connecticut* v. *Johnson* prejudice issue. (See *Davis* v. *Kemp* (11th Cir. 1985) 752 F.2d 1515, cert. den., 471 U.S. 1143 [86 L.Ed.2d 706, 105 S.Ct. 2689], and White, J., dis. at pp. 1144-1145 [86 L.Ed.2d at pp. 707-708, 105 S.Ct. at pp. 2690-2691.) Thus, if this court was wrong in *Garcia*, the Supreme Court has yet to say so.

Nor, for that matter, do I believe we can take guidance in our *Carlos-Garcia* cases from the federal circuit courts' treatment of *Sandstrom-Con-*

necticut v. *Johnson* error.[2] Although the reasoning of those cases is not always consistent, the above-cited courts often have affirmed in the face of *Sandstrom-Connecticut* v. *Johnson* error upon finding that (i) the defendant actually or impliedly "conceded" the issue of intent by putting on a particular defense and thereby failing to put his mens rea in issue and (ii) that the record establishes the defendant's intent "overwhelmingly." Although these cases suggest an appealing solution to *Sandstrom-Connecticut* v. *Johnson* error, I must conclude they do not assist our *Carlos-Garcia* analysis for two reasons.

First, it is not clear to me that the federal circuit court cases give due consideration to what we emphasized in *Garcia*—the effect of an evidentiary void created by the very instructional error in question. (36 Cal.3d at p. 556.) Specifically, none of the federal cases explain why it is permissible to consider whether the record establishes the defendant's intent when, by the instructions given, the defendant had little (if any) incentive to put on such evidence if he had it. Therefore, I am not convinced that the United States Supreme Court would endorse the course taken by the federal circuit courts in *Sandstrom-Connecticut* v. *Johnson* error cases. As noted, the high court has yet to rule on the issue.

Second, even assuming the federal circuit courts are correct in their implicit holdings that a *Sandstrom-Connecticut* v. *Johnson* defendant can be deemed to have had some incentive to put on lack-of-intent evidence (and therefore an appellate court may properly review the record as it exists to determine whether intent is proved "overwhelmingly"), I strongly question whether the same incentive to produce such evidence can be deemed to have

[2]A number of pre-*Connecticut* v. *Johnson* cases addressed the prejudice issue. See, e.g., the 11 cases discussed in *Connecticut* v. *Johnson*, *supra*, 460 U.S. 73, 75, footnote 1 [74 L.Ed.2d 823, 826]. Post-*Connecticut* v. *Johnson* cases include: *Engle* v. *Koehler* (6th Cir. 1983) 707 F.2d 241 (reversing; defendant claimed diminished capacity), affirmed by an equally divided court, 466 U.S. 1 [80 L.Ed.2d 1, 104 S.Ct. 1673] (mem.); *Franklin* v. *Francis* (11th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 1206 (reversing; defendant claimed diminished capacity), affirmed, 471 U.S. 307 [85 L.Ed.2d 344, 345, 105 S.Ct. 1965, 1977] (declining to rule on the standard of prejudice); *Penton of Hamilton* (9th Cir. 1983) 721 F.2d 1189 (reversing; defendant claimed self-defense and diminished capacity); *Fulton* v. *Warden, Md. Penitentiary* (4th Cir. 1984) 744 F.2d 1026 (affirming; defendant claimed alibi); *Davis* v. *Kemp* (11th Cir. 1985) 752 F.2d 1515 (en banc) (affirming; defendant claimed noninvolvement), certiorari denied, 471 U.S. 1143 [86 L.Ed.2d 706, 105 S.Ct. 2689]; *McCleskey* v. *Kemp* (11th Cir. 1985) 753 F.2d 877 (affirming; defendant claimed alibi); *Brooks* v. *Kemp* (11th Cir. 985) 762 F.2d 1383 (en banc) (reversing; defendant claimed noninvolvement and accident); *Tucker* v. *Kemp* (11th Cir. 1985) 762 F.2d 1496 (en banc) (affirming; defendant claimed noninvolvement); *Hagler* v. *Callahan* (9th Cir. 1985) 764 F.2d 711 (affirming; defendant claimed alibi); *Church* v. *Kincheloe* (9th Cir. 1985) 767 F.2d 639 (affirming; defendant claimed mistake of fact); *Bowen* v. *Kemp* (11th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 672 (affirming although defendant claimed insanity). See also *Guyton* v. *LaFevre* (S.D.N.Y. 1983) 560 F.Supp. 1237 (affirming; defendant claimed alibi).

nose cases is not
ned in the face of
(i) the defendant
tting on a partic-
e and (ii) that the
" Although these
ticut v. *Johnson*
analysis for two

rt cases give due
of an evidentiary
n. (36 Cal.3d at
v it is permissible
intent when, by
centive to put on
d that the United
he federal circuit
s noted, the high

rrect in their im-
defendant can be
nt evidence (and
rd as it exists to
strongly question
e deemed to have

ice issue. See, e.g.,
. 75, footnote 1 [74
v. *Koehler* (6th Cir.
ty), affirmed by an
mem.); *Franklin* v.
iminished capacity),
(declining to rule on
2d 1189 (reversing;
ardon, Md. Peniten-
bi); *Davis* v. *Kemp*
d noninvolvement),
McCleskey v. *Kemp*
ooks v. *Kemp* (11th
nvolvement and ac-
affirming; defendant
.2d 711 (affirming;
.2d 639 (affirming;
F.2d 672 (affirming
.D.N.Y. 1983) 560

existed in *Carlos-Garcia* cases. The difference between the two situations is significant. Jurors in *Sandstrom-Connecticut* v. *Johnson* error cases have been erroneously instructed in a variety of ways, but they have essentially been left with the impression that, although intent needed to be proved, the defendant's acts conclusively proved his intent, or that it was the defendant's burden to disprove his intent. In such a situation an appellate court might reasonably conclude that a defendant, knowing that such an instruction on intent would be given, nevertheless had a significant incentive to put on lack-of-intent evidence, if any he had. Jurors in *Carlos-Garcia* cases, on the other hand, have been given instructions that omit intent to kill as an element of a special circumstance. In this situation an appellate court cannot (except perhaps in rare situations) reasonably conclude that a defendant, knowing instructions omitting intent as an element would be given, nevertheless had an incentive to put on lack-of-intent evidence he may have had. With this latter proposition, even the *Connecticut* v. *Johnson* dissenting justices agree: As Justice Powell stated for three of his colleagues, an instruction that removes the issue of intent from the jury's consideration *precludes* an appellate court from determining whether the error was harmless. (460 U.S. at pp. 95-96 [74 L.Ed.2d at pp. 839-840, 103 S.Ct. at pp. 982-983].)

The dissent in the present case, purporting to apply *Garcia* analysis, advances a dual approach for avoiding reversal: (1) on the record as it stands, intent to kill is clear; and (2) we can be satisfied that even if defendant had been aware that intent was an issue in the special circumstances phase of his trial the record would have been no more favorable to him on that point. The first aspect of the dissent's argument is adequately treated in the majority's opinion; I focus here on the second.

The dissent argues that although intent to kill was not relevant during the guilt phase, defendant had a strong incentive to present evidence showing lack of intent at the penalty phase, and because he did not do so we may safely assume no such evidence exists.

The dissent makes no attempt to fit this argument into the *Garcia* framework of analysis. I assume that if it were to fit anywhere, it would be within the *Cantrell-Thornton* exception. But that exception requires, as a threshold matter, that the parties have "recognized" intent as an issue, and "presented all evidence at their command on that issue." (*People* v. *Garcia*, *supra*, 36 Cal.3d at p. 556.) Obviously, defendant did not "recognize" intent to be an issue at the special circumstances phase since, under the court's instructions, it was plainly not. I gather what the dissent is suggesting is that the "intent recognized" requirement of the *Cantrell-Thornton* exception should be deemed met on the basis that defendant had an incen-

tive, at the penalty phase, to present evidence bearing on lack of intent in mitigation so that the evidentiary void on this subject in fact represented "all the evidence at [his] command."

Perhaps there are cases in which the incentive to come forward with evidence bearing on intent at the penalty phase is so clear that it may be said with positive assurance that the defendant, properly represented, would have done so, but such a conclusion entails the assumption that competent counsel would have had no tactical reason to withhold such evidence had it been available. I do not believe we can make that assumption here. Here, as in many cases, defendant had every reason at the penalty phase to attempt to turn the jury's attention away from the facts of the underlying crime and direct it instead towards his family background and positive relationships and conduct. Even if he had evidence which—if introduced at the special circumstance stage—might have raised a reasonable doubt on the intent to kill issue, his counsel might well have concluded that, since no finding of intent to kill beyond a reasonable doubt was required at the penalty phase, little would be gained by redirecting the jury's focus at that point towards defendant's conduct which resulted in the victim's death. Reopening the facts of the crime may well have detracted from defense counsel's effort to have the jury conduct an overview of his life in determining whether he should live or die. Thus, the absence of evidence in this regard at the penalty phase does not demonstrate that there is no such evidence that could have been presented.[3]

Perhaps the United States Supreme Court will grant certiorari in this or another case and tell us we were wrong in *Garcia*, but until it does our obligation is to apply the law as we find it. I concur in the judgment.

BIRD, C. J.—(1d), (2d), (3c), (4d), (5c-9c), (10d), (11c) I concur fully in Justice Kaus's fine opinion.

Since the special circumstance findings and penalty judgment must be reversed as a result of the trial court's error under *Carlos* v. *Superior Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131 [197 Cal.Rptr. 79, 672 P.2d 862], the majority correctly decline to note the existence of other special circumstance or penalty phase issues which might require reversal of those verdicts.

[3] I would be prepared to depart from rigid application of the "intent recognized" requirement and affirm on the record as it stands, were it inconceivable that any reasonable juror would have found the defendant lacked intent to kill, no matter what evidence (other than evidence of diminished capacity) he might have produced on that issue. In such a case I would affirm the penalty verdict contingent on defendant's right to present diminished capacity evidence, if any he has, in a habeas corpus proceeding. Again, this is not such a case.

ack of intent in
act represented

: forward with
that it may be
esented, would
that competent
evidence had it
on here. Here,
hase to attempt
lying crime and
e relationships
d at the special
on the intent to
e no finding of
penalty phase,
t point towards
Reopening the
unsel's effort to
ing whether he
d at the penalty
that could have

iorari in this or
ntil it does our
judgment.

I concur fully

(gment must be
Superior Court
e majority cor-
tance or penalty

cognized" require-
ry reasonable juror
vidence (other than
e. In such a case I
ent diminished ca-
e is not such a case.

In this case, the trial court gave the so-called "Briggs commutation instruction" that this court has held invalid on state due process grounds in *People* v. *Ramos* (1984) 37 Cal.3d 136 [207 Cal.Rptr. 800, 689 P.2d 430]. In addition, the trial court failed to exercise its discretion to strike the special circumstance findings under *People* v. *Williams* (1980) 30 Cal.3d 470 [179 Cal.Rptr. 443, 637 P.2d 1029]. Since these issues might require reversal, the final vote in this case does not reflect the views of the justices on these errors.

LUCAS, J., Concurring and Dissenting.—(1e), (2e), (3d), (4e), (5c), (6d-9d) I concur in the majority opinion to the extent it affirms defendant's conviction of first degree murder, burglary, robbery and kidnapping. I respectfully dissent, however, to the setting aside of the special circumstances finding and penalty judgment.

The majority relies upon *People* v. *Garcia* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 539 [205 Cal.Rptr. 265, 684 P.2d 826], and *Carlos* v. *Superior Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131 [197 Cal.Rptr. 79, 672 P.2d 862], in concluding that the failure to instruct the jury regarding intent to kill was prejudicial error requiring us to set aside the special circumstances finding and the penalty judgment. For reasons I have previously explained, I strongly disagree with the holdings in those cases (see *People* v. *Whitt* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 724, 749 [205 Cal.Rptr. 810, 685 P.2d 1161] [dis. opn.]), and I can no longer concur in judgments which reverse special circumstances findings under their compulsion (see *People* v. *Guerra* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 377, 389 [220 Cal.Rptr. 374, 708 P.2d 1252] [dis opn.]).

The concurring opinion by Justice Grodin reluctantly agrees that *Carlos*/*Garcia* principles apply here. He attempts to place responsibility for those cases upon the shoulders of the United States Supreme Court and its fragmented decision in *Connecticut* v. *Johnson* (1983) 460 U.S. 73 [74 L.Ed.2d 823, 103 S.Ct. 969], a case which appears to impose a per se reversal rule whenever the issue of intent is *improperly* removed from the jury's consideration. I have no quarrel with that case, whatever principle may be gleaned from the various opinions written therein. My principal quarrel is with *Carlos* itself, wherein my colleagues rewrote Penal Code section 190.2, subdivision (a)(17), and introduced an "intent to kill" requirement which was mandated by neither state nor federal law. (See *Carlos* v. *Superior Court*, *supra*, 35 Cal.3d 131, 156-159 [dis. opn. by Richardson, J.].) As we proceed to reverse one death penalty judgment after another on *Carlos* grounds, let us not assign the blame to some other court—the fault is ours. I continue to urge reconsideration and disapproval of that unfortunate decision.

But even were *Carlos* considered "good law," it does not require setting aside the special circumstances finding in this case. Here, defendant's intent

to kill was established as a matter of law, and no contrary evidence was introduced which might raise a possible doubt on the issue.

As the majority acknowledges, defendant's victim was stripped to her underwear, bound hand and foot, repeatedly stabbed, partially dismembered and finally decapitated. At least one stab wound, to the stomach, probably occurred prior to her death. The majority postulates, however, that "The victim might have been killed accidentally, with defendant deciding afterwards to mutilate the body in an attempt to prevent identification. [Fn. omitted.] We simply do not have enough evidence as to the circumstances of the victim's death to be able to conclude that intent to kill was established as a matter of law." (*Ante*, p. 432.)

To the contrary, I suggest that the condition of Mrs. Buchanan's body amply established an intent to kill in the absence of *any* evidence in the record supporting the majority's accidental death theory. We cannot reverse a judgment, even a death penalty judgment, based on nothing more than mere speculation or surmise. (See Cal. Const., art. VI, § 13 [requiring a "miscarriage of justice"].)

It is simply inconceivable that, if the killing were indeed "accidental," defendant would have neglected to attempt to prove that fact. Although lack of intent to kill was not relevant during the guilt phase, it would have been a strong mitigating factor at the *penalty* phase of the trial. (See Pen. Code, § 190.3, subds. (a) [circumstances of the crime], (d) [extreme mental or emotional disturbance], (f) [reasonable belief killing was justified], (g) [extreme duress], (h) [impaired capacity to appreciate criminality of conduct or conform to law], and (k) [any other extenuating circumstance].) Yet, defendant's penalty phase evidence was limited to general character and background evidence, and pleas by defendant's friends and relatives to spare his life. Can there be any reasonable doubt whatever that defendant would have presented evidence bearing on his lack of intent to kill had there been any such evidence to present?[1]

My colleagues continue to reverse capital cases on *Carlos/Garcia* grounds, despite the fact that in many of these cases it is readily apparent that the defendant possessed the requisite intent to kill, and that a failure to instruct on that issue was, at worst, harmless error.

[1]Justice Grodin, in his concurring opinion, speculates that trial counsel may have had a tactical reason for failing to raise potentially mitigating evidence regarding defendant's lack of intent to kill. Any such "tactics" would border upon incompetence in light of the absence of any other significant mitigating evidence presented at the penalty phase. I believe we should assume the more logical explanation—that no such evidence existed—and reserve to defendant his right to contradict their assumption in a habeas corpus proceeding.

evidence was

tripped to her
dismembered
nach, probably
ver, that "The
deciding after-
ification. [Fn.
circumstances
was established

chanan's body
vidence in the
cannot reverse
ing more than
3 [requiring a

"accidental,"
Although lack
uld have been
ee Pen. Code,
me mental or
ified], (g) [ex-
ity of conduct
stance].) Yet,
character and
atives to spare
fendant would
had there been

Carlos/Garcia
adily apparent
nat a failure to

I may have had a
; defendant's lack
ghi of the absence
ise. I believe we
d—and reserve to
eding.

I would affirm the judgment in its entirety.

MOSK, J.—(1f), (2f), (3e), (4f), (5d), (6e-9e) I concur in the majority opinion to the extent it affirms defendant's conviction of first degree murder, burglary, robbery and kidnapping, but I dissent to the setting aside of the special circumstances finding and the penalty.

I cannot join in Justice Lucas' criticism of *Carlos* v. *Superior Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131 [197 Cal.Rptr. 79, 672 P.2d 862]. Even if one be disillusioned by the number of penalty reversals required by that decision and by *People* v. *Garcia* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 539 [205 Cal.Rptr. 265, 684 P.2d 826], stare decisis and respect for the judicial process require adherence to decisions rendered so recently by a substantial majority of this court. A petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court was sought by the Attorney General in *Garcia*, and review in the high court was denied. (469 U.S. 1229 [84 L.Ed.2d 366, 105 S.Ct. 1229].) Thus *Carlos-Garcia* remains the law in California.

I agree with Justice Lucas, however, that even under *Carlos*, we need not set aside the special circumstance finding in this case. Intent to kill was manifest from the facts and no evidence was introduced by defendant that might raise a reasonable doubt on that issue.

Therefore I would affirm the judgment in its entirety.

Respondent's petition for a rehearing was denied March 13, 1986. Lucas, J., and Panelli, J., were of the opinion that the petition should be granted.

APPENDIX 2

cy local or state
ited States and
s retaliation for
victim's official

ss.atrocious, or
, as utilized in
ss. atrocious or
means a con-
s unnecessarily

ded the victim

d because of his
ntry of origin.
e the defendant
the commission
mediate flight
t the following

11.
ss 207 and 209.

186.
rvious act upon
in violation of

Section 288a.
gree in violation

47.
ection 219.
d involved the
of this section
xtreme physical

d the victim by

e actual killer
ing, counseling,
ing, or assisting
the first degree
ife prison for a
ole, in any case
circumstances
5), (6), (7), (8),
), (17), (18), or
as been charged
.14 to be true.
rovided in Sec-
2.5. *(Added by*
7, 1978.)

nmendment to
183 Cal.Rptr. 800.

Former § 190.2 was repealed by § 5 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.

Former § 190.3, added by Stats.1973, c. 719, § 5, relating to similar subject matter, was repealed by Stats.1977, c. 316, § 6.

Cross References

Assault by life prisoner, offense punishable by death, see § 4500.
Death penalty, not deemed cruel or unusual punishment, see Const. Art. I, § 27.
Execution of death penalty, see § 3600 et seq.
Judgment of death,
Appellate jurisdiction of Supreme Court, see Const. Art. 6, § 11.
Delivery of commitment to sheriff, see § 1217.
Opinion of justices of Supreme Court, see § 1219.
Statement of reasons, see § 1218.

§ 190.25. Life imprisonment without parole; transportation personnel; accomplices

(a) The penalty for a defendant found guilty of murder in the first degree shall be confinement in state prison for a term of life without the possibility of parole in any case in which any of the following special circumstances has been charged and specially found under Section 190.4, to be true: the victim was the operator or driver of a bus, taxicab, streetcar, cable car, trackless trolley, or other motor vehicle operated on land, including a vehicle operated on stationary rails or on a track or rail suspended in the air, used for the transportation of persons for hire, or the victim was a station agent or ticket agent for the entity providing such transportation, who, while engaged in the course of the performance of his or her duties was intentionally killed, and such defendant knew or reasonably should have known that such victim was the operator or driver of a bus, taxicab, streetcar, cable car, trackless trolley, or other motor vehicle operated on land, including a vehicle operated on stationary rails or on a track or rail suspended in the air, used for the transportation of persons for hire, or was a station agent or ticket agent for the entity providing such transportation, engaged in the performance of his or her duties.

(b) Every person whether or not the actual killer found guilty of intentionally aiding, abetting, counseling, commanding, inducing, soliciting, requesting, or assisting any actor in the commission of murder in the first degree shall suffer confinement in state prison for a term of life without the possibility of parole, in any case in which one or more of the special circumstances enumerated in subdivision (a) of this section has been charged and specially found under Section 190.4 to be true.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the charging or finding of any special circumstance pursuant to Sections 190.1, 190.2, 190.3, 190.4, and 190.5. *(Added by Stats. 1982, c. 172, § 1.)*

§ 190.3. Death penalty or life imprisonment; determination by trier; evidence of aggravating and mitigating circumstances; factors

If the defendant has been found guilty of murder in the first degree, and a special circumstance has been charged and found to be true, or if the defendant may be subject to the death penalty after having been found guilty of violating subdivision (a) of Section 1672 of the Military and Veterans Code or Sections 37, 128, 219 or 4500 of this code, the trier of fact shall determine whether the penalty shall be death or confinement in state prison for a term of life without the possibility of parole. In the proceedings on the question of penalty, evidence may be presented by both the people and the defendant as to any matter relevant to aggravation, mitigation, and sentence including, but not limited to, the nature and circumstances of the present offense, any prior felony conviction or convictions whether or not such conviction or convictions involved a crime of violence, the presence or absence of other criminal activity by the defendant which involved the use or attempted use of force or violence or which involved the express or implied threat to use force or violence, and the defendant's character, background, history, mental condition and physical condition.

However, no evidence shall be admitted regarding other criminal activity by the defendant which did not involve the use or attempted use of force or violence or which did not involve the express or implied threat to use force or violence. As used in this section, criminal activity does not require a conviction.

However, in no event shall evidence of prior criminal activity be admitted for an offense for which the defendant was prosecuted and acquitted. The restriction on the use of this evidence is intended to apply only to proceedings pursuant to this section and is not intended to affect statutory or decisional law allowing such evidence to be used in any other proceedings.

Except for evidence in proof of the offense or special circumstances which subject a defendant to the death penalty, no evidence may be presented by the prosecution in aggravation unless notice of the evidence to be introduced has been given to the defendant within a reasonable period of time as determined by the court, prior to trial. Evidence may be introduced without such notice in rebuttal to evidence introduced by the defendant in mitigation.

The trier of fact shall be instructed that a sentence of confinement to state prison for a term of life without the possibility of parole may in future after sentence is imposed, be commuted or modified to a sentence that includes the possibility of parole by the Governor of the State of California.

In determining the penalty, the trier of fact shall take into account any of the following factors if relevant:

(a) The circumstances of the crime of which the defendant was convicted in the present proceeding and the existence of any special circumstances found to be true pursuant to Section 190.1.

(b) The presence or absence of criminal activity by the defendant which involved the use or attempted use of force or violence or the express or implied threat to use force or violence.

(c) The presence or absence of any prior felony conviction.

(d) Whether or not the offense was committed while the defendant was under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance.

(e) Whether or not the victim was a participant in the defendant's homicidal conduct or consented to the homicidal act.

(f) Whether or not the offense was committed under circumstances which the defendant reasonably believed to be a moral justification or extenuation for his conduct.

(g) Whether or not defendant acted under extreme duress or under the substantial domination of another person.

(h) Whether or not at the time of the offense the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was impaired as a result of mental disease or defect, or the effects of intoxication.

(i) The age of the defendant at the time of the crime.

(j) Whether or not the defendant was an accomplice to the offense and his participation in the commission of the offense was relatively minor.

(k) Any other circumstance which extenuates the gravity of the crime even though it is not a legal excuse for the crime.

After having heard and received all of the evidence, and after having heard and considered the arguments of counsel, the trier of fact shall consider, take into account and be guided by the aggravating and mitigating circumstances referred to in this section, and shall impose a sentence of death if the trier of fact concludes that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances. If the trier of fact determines that the mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstances the trier of fact shall impose a sentence of confinement in state prison for a term of life without the possibility of parole. *(Added by § 8 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.)*

Former § 190.3 was repealed by § 7 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.

Former § 190.3, added by Stats.1973, c. 719, § 6, prohibiting death penalty in certain circumstances, was repealed by Stats.1977, c. 316, § 10. See, also, § 190.5.

Cross References

Burden of proving mitigating circumstances in trial for murder, see § 1105.

Death penalty, not deemed cruel or unusual punishment, see Const. Art. I, § 27.

Treason, admissibility of evidence of overt act, see § 1102.7.

§ 190.4. Special circumstances; special findings; penalty hearing; application for modification

(a) Whenever special circumstances as enumerated in Section 190.2 are alleged and the trier of fact finds the defendant guilty of first degree murder, the trier of fact shall also make a special finding on the truth of each alleged special circumstance. The determination of the truth of any or all of the special circumstances shall be made by the trier of fact on the evidence presented at the trial or at the hearing held pursuant to Subdivision (b) of Section 190.1.

In case of a reasonable doubt as to whether a special circumstance is true, the defendant is entitled to a finding that it is not true. The trier of fact shall make a special finding that each special circumstance charged is either true or not true. Whenever a special circumstance requires proof of the commission or attempted commission of a crime, such crime shall be charged and proved pursuant to the general law applying to the trial and conviction of the crime.

If the defendant was convicted by the court sitting without a jury, the trier of fact shall be a jury unless a jury is waived by the defendant and by the people, in which case the trier of fact shall be the court. If the defendant was convicted by a plea of guilty, the trier of fact shall be a jury unless a jury is waived by the defendant and by the people.

If the trier of fact finds that any one or more of the special circumstances enumerated in Section 190.2 as charged is true, there shall be a separate penalty hearing, and neither the finding that any of the remaining special circumstances charged is not true, nor if the trier of fact is a jury, the inability of the jury to agree on the issue of the truth or untruth of any of the remaining special circumstances charged, shall prevent the holding of a separate penalty hearing.

In any case in which the defendant has been found guilty by a jury, and the jury has been unable to reach a unanimous verdict that one or more of the special circumstances charged are true, and does not reach a unanimous verdict that all the special circumstances charged are not true, the court shall dismiss the jury and shall order a new jury impaneled to try the issues, but the issue of guilt shall not be tried by such jury, nor shall such jury retry the issue of the truth of any of the special circumstances which were found by a unanimous verdict of the previous jury to be untrue. If such new jury is unable to reach the unanimous verdict that one or more of the special circumstances it is trying are true, the court shall dismiss the jury and in the court's discretion shall either order a new jury impaneled to try the issues the previous jury was unable to reach the unanimous verdict on, or impose a punishment of confinement in state prison for a term of 25 years.

(b) If defendant was convicted by the court sitting without a jury the trier of fact at the penalty hearing shall be a jury unless a jury is waived by the defendant and the people, in which case the trier of fact shall be the court. If the defendant was convicted by a plea of guilty, the trier of fact shall be a jury unless a jury is waived by the defendant and the people.

If the trier of fact is a jury and has been unable to reach a unanimous verdict as to what the penalty shall be, the court shall dismiss the jury and shall order a new jury impaneled to try the issue as to what the penalty shall be. If such new jury is unable to reach a unanimous verdict as to what the penalty shall be, the court in its discretion shall either order a new jury or

to Subdivision (b) of

to whether a special
s entitled to a finding
shall make a special
nce charged is either
special circumstance
r attempted commis-
charged and proved
ing to the trial and

by the court sitting
ll be a jury unless a
ed by the people, in
e the court. If the
of guilty, the trier of
y is waived by the

one or more of the
in Section 190.2 as
rate penalty hearing,
he remaining special
or if the trier of fact
agree on the issue of
e remaining special
nt the holding of a

fant has been found
en unable to reach a
more of the special
d does not reach a
pecial circumstances
dismiss the jury and
ry the issues, but the
such jury, nor shall
of any of the special
a unanimous verdict
If such new jury is
ict that one or more
ng are true, the court
urt's discretion shall
to try the issues the
e unanimous verdict
confinement in state

by the court sitting
penalty hearing shall
he defendant and the
ct shall be the court.
a plea of guilty, the
jury is waived by the

has been unable to
hat the penalty shall
nd shall order a new
to what the penalty
unable to reach a
penalty shall be, the
order a new jury or

impose a punishment of confinement in state prison for a term of life without the possibility of parole.

(c) If the trier of fact which convicted the defendant of a crime for which he may be subject to the death penalty was a jury, the same jury shall consider any plea of not guilty by reason of insanity pursuant to Section 1026, the truth of any special circumstances which may be alleged, and the penalty to be applied, unless for good cause shown the court discharges that jury in which case a new jury shall be drawn. The court shall state facts in support of the finding of good cause upon the record and cause them to be entered into the minutes.

(d) In any case in which the defendant may be subject to the death penalty, evidence presented at any prior phase of the trial, including any proceeding under a plea of not guilty by reason of insanity pursuant to Section 1026 shall be considered at any subsequent phase of the trial, if the trier of fact of the prior phase is the same trier of fact at the subsequent phase.

(e) In every case in which the trier of fact has returned a verdict or finding imposing the death penalty, the defendant shall be deemed to have made an application for modification of such verdict or finding pursuant to Subdivision 7 of Section 11. In ruling on the application, the judge shall review the evidence, consider, take into account, and be guided by the aggravating and mitigating circumstances referred to in Section 190.3, and shall make a determination as to whether the jury's findings and verdicts that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances are contrary to law or the evidence presented. The judge shall state on the record the reasons for his findings.

The judge shall set forth the reasons for his ruling on the application and direct that they be entered on the Clerk's minutes. The denial of the modification of the death penalty verdict pursuant to subdivision (7) of Section 1181 shall be reviewed on the defendant's automatic appeal pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1239. The granting of the application shall be reviewed on the People's appeal pursuant to paragraph (6) of subdivision (a) of § 1238 *(Added by § 10 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.)*

Former § 190.4 was repealed by § 9 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.

Cross References

Burden of proving mitigating circumstances in trial for murder, see § 1105.

Treason, admissibility of evidence of overt act, see § 1102.7.

§ 190.5. Death penalty; exclusion of persons under 18; proof

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the death penalty shall not be imposed upon any person who is under the age of 18 at the time of the commission of the crime. The burden of proof as to the age of such person shall be upon the defendant. *(Added by § 12 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.)*

Former § 190.5 was repealed by § 11 of Initiative Measure approved Nov. 7, 1978.

Former § 190.5 was repealed by Stats.1976, c. 139, § 350.4

§ 190.6. Legislative finding; limitations

The Legislature finds that the imposition of sentence in all capital cases should be expeditiously carried out.

Therefore, in all cases in which a sentence of death has been imposed, the appeal to the State Supreme Court must be decided and an opinion reaching the merits must be filed within 150 days of certification of the entire record by the sentencing court. In any case in which this time requirement is not met, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court shall state on the record the extraordinary and compelling circumstances causing the delay and the facts supporting these circumstances. A failure to comply with the time requirements of this section shall not be grounds for precluding the ultimate imposition of the death penalty. *(Added by Stats.1977, c. 316, § 14.)*

§ 190.7. Entire record; contents; preparation and certification of record on appeal

The "entire record" referred to in Section 190.6 shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) The normal and additional record prescribed in the rules adopted by the Judicial Council pertaining to an appeal taken by the defendant from a judgment of conviction.

(b) A copy of any other paper or record on file or lodged with the superior court and a transcript of any other oral proceeding reported in the superior court pertaining to the trial of the cause.

Nothing contained in this section shall preclude a court from ordering that the entire record include municipal court or settlement proceedings pertaining to the case.

Notwithstanding this section, the Judicial Council may adopt rules, not inconsistent with the purpose of Section 190.6, specifically pertaining to the content, preparation and certification of the record on appeal when a judgment of death has been pronounced. *(Added by Stats. 1982, c. 917, § 1.)*

§ 190.8. Death penalty; expeditious certification of record on appeal

In any case in which a death sentence has been imposed, the record on appeal shall be expeditiously certified. If the record has not been certified within 60 days of the date it is delivered to the parties or their counsel, the trial court shall monitor the preparation of the record monthly to expedite certification and report the status of the record to the California Supreme Court.

Corrections to the record shall not be required to include simple typographical errors that cannot conceivably cause confusion. *(Added by Stats.1984, c. 1422, § 1.)*